CMP-SPRCM-75-36

SELECTIONS FROM PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA MAGAZINES

AMERICAN CONSULATE GENERAL
HONG KONG, B.C.C.

DECEMBER 16, 1975

U.I.C.C.
FEB 9 1976
LIBRARY

DISTRIBUTED BY:

NTIS
National Technical Information Service
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

KEEP UP TO DATE

Between the time you ordered this report—which is only one of the hundreds of thousands in the NTIS information collection available to you—and the time you are reading this message, several *new* reports relevant to your interests probably have entered the collection.

Subscribe to the **Weekly Government Abstracts** series that will bring you summaries of new reports *as soon as they are received by NTIS* from the originators of the research. The WGA's are an NTIS weekly newsletter service covering the most recent research findings in 25 areas of industrial, technological, and sociological interest—invaluable information for executives and professionals who must keep up to date.

The executive and professional information service provided by NTIS in the **Weekly Government Abstracts** newsletters will give you thorough and comprehensive coverage of government-conducted or sponsored research activities. And you'll get this important information within two weeks of the time it's released by originating agencies.

WGA newsletters are computer produced and electronically photocomposed to slash the time gap between the release of a report and its availability. You can learn about technical innovations immediately—and use them in the most meaningful and productive ways possible for your organization. Please request NTIS-PR-205/PCW for more information.

The weekly newsletter series will keep you current. But *learn what you have missed in the past* by ordering a computer **NTISearch** of all the research reports in your area of interest, dating as far back as 1964, if you wish. Please request NTIS-PR-186/PCN for more information.

WRITE: Managing Editor
5285 Port Royal Road
Springfield, VA 22161

Keep Up To Date With SRIM

SRIM (Selected Research in Microfiche) provides you with regular, automatic distribution of the complete texts of NTIS research reports *only* in the subject areas you select. SRIM covers almost all Government research reports by subject area and/or the originating Federal or local government agency. You may subscribe by any category or subcategory of our WGA **(Weekly Government Abstracts)** or **Government Reports Announcements and Index** categories, or to the reports issued by a particular agency such as the Department of Defense, Federal Energy Administration, or Environmental Protection Agency. Other options that will give you greater selectivity are available on request.

The cost of SRIM service is only 45¢ domestic (60¢ foreign) for each complete microfiched report. Your SRIM service begins as soon as your order is received and processed and you will receive biweekly shipments thereafter. If you wish, your service will be backdated to furnish you microfiche of reports issued earlier.

Because of contractual arrangements with several Special Technology Groups, not all NTIS reports are distributed in the SRIM program. You will receive a notice in your microfiche shipments identifying the exceptionally priced reports not available through SRIM.

A deposit account with NTIS is required before this service can be initiated. If you have specific questions concerning this service, please call (703) 451-1558, or write NTIS, attention SRIM Product Manager.

This information product distributed by

NTIS U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
National Technical Information Service
5285 Port Royal Road
Springfield, Virginia 22161

CMP-SPRCM-75-36

Selections from People's Republic of China Magazines

American Consulate General
Hong Kong

No. 850
December 16, 1975

This edition is printed in the United States of America for dissemination in the Western Hemisphere, Europe, the Mediterranean, and the west coast of Africa from material produced by the American Consulate General, Hong Kong. All queries concerning this edition should be sent to:

National Technical Information
Service (152.12)
U.S. Department of Commerce
Springfield, Virginia 22151

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

(Li-shih Yen-chiu /Historical Research/)

The Yang Wu Movement and the Slavish Comprador Philosophy - by Liang Hsiao 1

The Chinese Communist Party Is the Leader in the War of Resistance Against Japan - by K'o Shih 11

A Live Specimen of the Great Russian Chauvinism - by Sung Pin . . . 23

The History of the Willow Pale and the Fallacies of the Soviet Revisionists - by Chi Shih 36

Reproduced by
NATIONAL TECHNICAL
INFORMATION SERVICE
US Department of Commerce
Springfield, VA. 22151

PRICES SUBJECT TO CHANGE

Page

TABLE OF CONTENTS:

Historical Research, No. 3
June 20, 1975 48

Historical Research, No. 4
August 20, 1975 50

* * *

Unless otherwise indicated, these materials are full translations of articles appearing in People's Republic of China periodicals.

The Yang Wu Movement and the Slavish Comprador Philosophy

by

Liang Hsiao (梁效)

(Li-shih Yen-chiu /Historical Research/, No. 5, October 20, 1975)

The slavish comprador philosophy, a concomitant of imperialist aggression against China, formed an ideology of the landlord and comprador bourgeois classes during the Yang Wu Movement (洋务 or the 'Westernization' Movement which aimed mainly at establishing an armament industry). For a long time it was an important ideological basis for reactionaries at home to push the line of worshipping foreign things, fawning upon foreigners, capitulation and national betrayal. The big traitors Tseng Kuo-fan, Li Hung-chang, Yüan Shih-k'ai and Chiang Kai-shek as well as the chieftains of the opportunist line within the Party, Liu Shao-ch'i and Lin Piao, were all fanatical trumpeters of the slavish comprador philosophy. So deep-rooted has this reactionary philosophy been and so extensively has its poison spread that its influence is still felt today. Therefore it is still of practical significance to criticize the slavish comprador philosophy.

I

The Yang Wu Movement took place from the 1860's to the 1890's. Having suffered from defeat in two opium wars and the stunning blows from the T'ai-p'ing T'ien-kuo peasant revolutionary movement, the corrupt Ch'ing Dynasty was faced with a grave situation. The reactionary ruling clique, which regarded peasant uprisings as the "threat within the nation,"* stepped up its collaboration with imperialism. A number of feudal aristocrats, bureaucrats and warlords like I Hsin, Tseng Kuo-fan and Li Hung-chang were in favor of using foreign "sharp weapons" to stamp out the revolution and rescue the tottering rule of the Ch'ing Government. It was in this way that the Yang Wu Movement, which called for "making the nation strong through Western Learning," was unfolded.

The program of the Yang Wu Movement was "Chinese Learning is the substance and Western Learning is the functioning" (中学为体，西学为用) as summed up by Chang Chih-tung, leader of the Yang Wu group in its final stages. What was meant by "Chinese Learning is the substance" was that the feudal system and the doctrines of Confucius and Mencius, used to govern the people for several thousand years, were regarded as the foundation and "unalterable," while "Western Learning is the functioning" meant that on the premise of "Chinese Learning as the substance," foreign technology and methods were used to build factories, mines, railroads and schools, to form and train a new-type navy and army in order to increase

---

* Book Series on Chinese Modern History: "The Yang Wu Movement," (1), p. 5.

the feudal ruling power. The Yang Wu group regarded the purchase and manufacture of foreign arms used to suppress the people as the central content and the "primary task" of the Yang Wu Movement, showing that they did not want to develop capitalism but to maintain the decadent feudal relations of production and the reactionary feudal autocracy. Just as Lu Hsün disclosed, they "learned foreign techniques for the purpose of preserving the Chinese old habits." Such a movement which sold out the nation and opposed the people naturally had the support of imperialism. As the then American ambassador to China, A. Burlingame, clearly indicated: "We're in favor of China organizing its own army and hiring foreign experts to train its soldiers."* It was their belief that through fostering the Yang Wu group, they could not only bring up a force of slavish compradores loyal to them, but also intensify the counter-revolutionary armed strength of the Ch'ing government in order to more effectively suppress the anti-imperialist, anti-feudal people's revolution. It follows that the Yang Wu Movement was entirely a product of the collusion between the feudal forces and imperialism.

Chairman Mao points out: "To meet the needs of aggression, imperialism created a comprador system and bureaucrat capital in China," and in the process also created "slavish compradores serving imperialism." The course of the Yang Wu Movement was one of the formation of the comprador system and the comprador class, and also one of the formation of the slavish comprador philosophy. The Yang Wu group was the first group of slavish compradores holding power in China's modern history. They had the mentality of worshipping foreign things and currying favor with foreigners to the extent that they would "rather give what they have to their friendly states than to their own house servants." Under the guidance of this thinking, the Yang Wu Movement could only be a movement which sold out the national interests and compromised with and capitulated to foreigners. The Yang Wu group first highly praised the imperialists for their "strong ships and powerful guns" and then, scared out of their wits by the "appearance of increasingly fine Western firearms," finally arrived at the absurd conclusion that "since their weapons and technology are superior to ours, we will ultimately lose even if we win temporarily."** Proceeding from this capitulationist theory that every war was bound to be lost, Tseng Kuo-fan and Li Hung-chang vigorously called for "observing the peace agreements" with the imperialists and "maintaining a good neighbor policy even if a little humiliation is suffered,"+ saying "even if they offend us first, we should not offend them later."++ It

---

* Quoted from Hu Sheng, "Imperialism and Chinese Politics."

** "The Yang Wu Movement," (1), p. 43.

\+ "Complete Works of Lord Tseng Wen-cheng: Manuscripts of Memorials," Vol. XXXV.

++ Li Hung-chang, "Conversation with the American Ambassador About Japanese Aggression Against Taiwan."

was precisely in accordance with this reactionary logic that Li Hung-chang personally signed one unequal peace treaty after another selling out the national interests and became a despicable traitor. Facts prove that worshipping foreign things and currying favor with foreigners will necessarily lead to political capitulation and national betrayal, and this is a law of history.

Economically the Yang Wu group also pushed a line of worshipping foreign things and fawning upon foreigners in operating enterprises. They believed that the Chinese were "conservative, conceited and lazy, content with the status quo," "have no soaring ambitions,"* and were inferior to foreigners in every respect. In running the foreign business, therefore, they could only copy from other countries and rely on foreigners in every way possible. The Chiangnan General Manufacturing Bureau, founded by Li Hung-chang, imported everything from machinery, raw materials to technicians both from England or the United States. Chang Chih-tung's Hanyang Foundry also "purchased foreign machinery and hired foreign technicians."** Even masons putting up factory buildings had to be foreigners, and bricks and screws had to be imported. As Hu Yü-fen, leader of the reformist group, pointed out on one occasion, the Yang Wu group had to "rely on foreigners in running its factories," "they do exactly as they are told," and "they simply follow the orders of the foreign experts in the manufacture of weapons and machinery without knowing what to do themselves." In this way, Hu concluded, "they can accomplish nothing even after a hundred years."+ As the Yang Wu group worshipped foreign things and fawned on foreigners, these enterprises completely fell under the control of foreigners both as regards management and technology, and the directors and supervisors appointed by the Chinese Government were practically left without power and had to submit to the orders of the foreigners, "allowing them to run everything without ever asking one single question."++ Moreover, many of the foreign machines bought at high costs were outdated and obsolete, and many of the foreign experts employed were just good-for-nothing politicians. Li Hung-chang even employed a British army doctor to supervise the production of guns, and the result was that a number of accidents involving explosions occurred when these guns were test fired. In the enterprises run by the Yang Wu group, accidents involving the leaking fire and gas in blast furnaces, the collapse of water towers and the leaking of steamships were frequent. Facts prove that running enterprises in this way was tantamount to "opening the door to invite the robbers in and being dominated by them," to handing over the leadership of these enterprises to the imperialist elements.

---

* Chang Chih-tung, "Persuasion on Learning."

** "Complete Works of Lord Chang Wen-hsiang: Matters in Memorials," Vol. XLIV.

\+ "Memorial on Acquiring Strength Through Reform."

++ Chang Chih-tung, "Perusasion on Learning."

The reactionary purpose of the Yang Wu Movement in suppressing the revolution and the line it followed on relying on foreign countries in everything, worshipping foreign things and currying favor with foreigners foretold its inevitable failure. The 30-year Yang Wu Movement only cleared the way for the imperialists to dump their commodities, export their capital and carve up China. By the 1880's and 1890's, more than 80 factories and more than 500 commercial firms were set up with foreign capital. Foreign capitalists and merchants also controlled the customs, finance, railways, shipping and foreign trade, vigorously robbed China of its wealth through various channels and avariciously sucked the blood of the Chinese people. Under their wings, members of the comprador class lined their pockets and became wealthy men, with some owning assets valued at ten million taels of silver. But the national economy, suffering from joint oppression by imperialism and the comprador class, was losing its breath. The Yang Wu Movement could not possibly make China "rich and strong" but caused it to go further down the road of a semi-colony. Russia occupied Illi of Sinkiang, Japan invaded Taiwan, and England forced the Ch'ing Government to sign the "Yent'ai /Chefoo/ Treaty".....All these incidents involving the loss of sovereignty and national humiliation, cession of land and payment of indemnities occurred during the Yang Wu Movement. After the Sino-French War and the Sino-Japanese Wars, the complete destruction in succession of the Fukien Navy and the Peiyang /Northern/ Navy was the main "achievement" of the Yang Wu group's "acquiring strength on one's own" activities. It pronounced the total bankruptcy of the Yang Wu Movement, besides fully revealing the reactionary and decadent nature of the slavish comprador philosophy.

II

The failure of the Yang Wu Movement, however, was not followed by the retreat and disappearance of the slavish comprador philosophy. On the contrary, expanded imperialist aggression resulted in the increasingly vicious development of this philosophy, which then became an important ruling thought from the Northern warlords to the Kuomintang reactionary government.

Yüan Shih-k'ai, leader of the Northern warlords, was a successor handpicked by Li Hung-chang, and Chiang Kai-shek was often likened by the Japanese imperialists to "China's past characters such as Yüan Shih-k'ai and Li Hung-chang."* In the eyes of the imperialists, they all were docile lackeys. Yüan Shih-k'ai and Chiang Kai-shek completely inherited the mantle of Li Hung-chang and Chang Chih-tung in worshipping foreign things and currying favor with foreigners. Up to 1950, the traitor Chiang Kai-shek still defended Chang Chih-tung's proposal to take "Chinese Learning as the substance and Western Learning as the functioning," saying "there was nothing wrong with this proposal if it were aimed at establishing a new Chinese system by merging Chinese and Western cultures into one."** As advertised by Chiang Kai-shek,

---

* "Enemies? Friends?"

** "In Building the Nation and the Army, A System Must First Be Established and the Atmosphere Created." (Concluded)

the "new Chinese system" was the semi-colonial, semi-feudal system, and what was meant by "merging the Chinese and Western cultures into one" was to establish a reactionary alliance between the slavish ideology of foreign imperialism and the revivalist ideology of Chinese feudalism," namely, the counter-revolutionary cause initiated by the Yang Wu group and carried on by Yüan Shih-k'ai and Chiang Kai-shek. If it were said that the slogan "Chinese Learning is the substance and Western Learning is the functioning" attempted to make the doctrines of Confucius and Mencius the master of this reactionary alliance, then, in the period of the Kuomintang reactionary rule, the slavish ideology of imperialism increasingly occupied an outstanding place, and the doctrines of Confucius and Mencius were further drawn into the orbit serving imperialist aggression. Worship of Confucius was completely identified with admiration of foreigners. "Wholesale Westernization" as advocated by Hu Shih, a scholar in the pay of Chiang Kai-shek, became a representative slogan in this period.

Politically "wholesale Westernization" meant loss of sovereignty and national humiliation, total sell-out of China's independence and self-determination. Through a series of treaties of national betrayal from the "21 Demands" signed by Yüan Shih-k'ai to the "Sino-American Commercial Treaty" signed by Chiang Kai-shek, imperialism rabidly "seized China's rights of territorial land, sea and air space and inland shipping, secured commercial, domestic and diplomatic privileges and the privilege of exemption from any punishment for beating people to death, driving people to commit suicide and raping women," and became the super-emperor in China. But people like Chiang Kai-shek turned themselves completely into faithful running dogs of imperialism in China. "It is a crime to love one's country, and prisons for the innocent are found everywhere in the land; those who betray their country are rewarded, and traitors throw up their hats and congratulate one another." Old China became a paradise for Western adventurers but a hell for the vast masses of the working people.

Ideologically "wholesale Westernization" was meant to praise what is foreign and belittle what is Chinese and propagate national nihilism in order to undermine the national consciousness of the Chinese people and prevent them from having the slightest Chinese spirit. Hu Shih, the comprador man of letters, described our country and nation as good for nothing. He said slanderously: China "is a broken stage -- poor China. Heaven gave our forefathers a piece of very poor land, not a piece of land of material abundance."* The Chinese were "a lazy people who looked ten percent human and 90 percent ghostly." "Not only are we inferior to others in terms of material resources and machinery....but we are also inferior to others morally and intellectually and in the fields of literature,music, art and physical culture."** In a word, China was "inferior to others in a hundred

---

* "One View of Chinese History."

** "Introducing My Thought."

things."* The dictator and enemy of the people, Chiang Kai-shek, also issued his stricture: "The Chinese themselves do not have much self-respect and cannot but concede to others in national morality and intelligence."** "What foreigners can accomplish in one day, the Chinese cannot accomplish in one year."*** For the sake of fawning upon and currying favor with their imperialist masters, these two lackeys were virtually competing with each other in slandering their own nation! What, then, was their conclusion? Hu Shih, pointing at the sky, swore: "If China does not perish, Heaven is unreasonable."+ Chiang Kai-shek asserted: China not only "cannot be equal with others,"++ but it "has no more elbow room for lucky survival,"+++ so any resistance against the aggressors was "suicidal" and the only choice was to be meek slaves of these big foreigners.

Economically "wholesale Westernization" was aimed at spreading blind faith in the Western capitalist material civilization so as to turn the Chinese economy into a complete appendage of imperialism. The lackey Hu Shih went out of his way to play up the theme that "the development of European and American science can be said to have reached its peak,"# lavishly praised the "motor car civilization" of the West and admired America for "having one car for every six persons," America "a land of motor cars."## Energetically he called for "emulating the country of the dollar." In that case, could China, with nothing but "a rickshaw civilization," develop its economy independently and with initiative in its own hands? No. Hu Shih said: "China has been established for five thousand years....At no time, it can be said, has it been able to hold the initiative in its own hands."### We "must recognize our own incompetence." "It is fortunate that the customs and postal services are in the hands of foreigners!"#### What Hu Shih said, Chiang Kai-shek did. He had China's material

---

* "Please Let Everybody Look At the Mirror."

** "The Central Criterion of the New Life Movement."

*** "The Way of China's Construction."

\+ Letter sent to Wu Chih-hui by Hu Shih from America.

++ "The Central Criterion of the New Life Movement."

+++ "Resisting Foreign Aggression and Reviving the Nation" (Part I).

\# "Hu Shih's Diary While Studying Abroad."

Quoted from Hou Wai-lu, "Expose the Reactionary Face of Hu Shih, Lackey of American Imperialism."

"One View of Chinese History."

"The International China."

resources "offered to the world under the open-door policy," and called for "international joint efforts to develop the Chinese industry."* Such a policy of leading the wolf into the house turned China into a market where the imperialist gangsters exported their capital, seized raw materials and dumped their goods, and turned the four big families of Chiang, Sung, K'ung and Ch'en into the biggest compradores in the country. To satisfy the unlimited greed of this small handful of people, Chiang Kai-shek cried aloud "we will not hesitate to make concessions if they are in the national interests."**

Under such a reactionary policy, the imperialists, through their collusion with comprador bureaucrat capital, controlled China's economic lifeline. They monopolized China's coal, iron and shipping industries, controlled China's finance, and occupied the ruling position in certain sectors of industry, particularly textile and cigarette manufacturing. American goods ranging from firearms and machines to rice, flour and cotton flooded the Chinese market. At official receptions given by the Kuomintang "even American peanuts appear." What a "wholesale Westernization"! As a result, there was run-away inflation, commodity prices soared as never before, the national industry and commerce became more and more bankrupt with each passing day, and the laboring masses, government employees and teachers of public schools faced a deteriorating living standard. In 1946, more than 20,000 factories and firms collapsed in 22 cities. In 1948, commodity prices rose 7 million times compared with 1937. There were over a hundred million hungry people in the country! Chiang Kai-shek's so-called "development of the Chinese industry" was a fraud and no more than that.

At present, Taiwan province, in which the Chiang gang is entrenched, is continuing this tragic course of colonialization. The survival and development of the Taiwan economy are entirely dependent on imperialism. When the Chiang gang shamelessly boasts of the "economic takeoff," it is merely like a fly dashing aimlessly on the debris of international monopoly capital.

"History itself is a judge." The blood-and-tears history of the Chinese people suffering from aggression and enslavement clearly shows that the road of "wholesale Westernization" is the road to national subjugation and that the slavish comprador philosophy is no more than a philosophy of national betrayal.

III

The victory of the Chinese revolution toppled the rule of imperialism and its running dogs, the Kuomintang reactionaries, uprooted the comprador system, and overthrew the comprador bourgeoisie. However, the slavish

---

* "Summary of Teachings Left by the Founding Father."

** "Soviet Russia in China."

comprador philosophy as an ideology of this class has not been put into a coffin and buried in a grave. The existence of classes and class struggle, the existence of the international bourgeois influence, and particularly the fact that imperialism and social-imperialism, in order to carry out aggression and subversion against our country, are continuing to seek new agents in our country, provide the conditions for the continued existence of the slavish comprador philosophy. So, our struggle against the slavish comprador philosophy and capitulationism is bound to be protracted and will necessarily be reflected within the Party and become an important aspect of the struggle between the two lines.

Can the victorious Chinese people rely on their own strength to build a new rich and strong China independently and with initiative? There are two totally different answers to this question. Chairman Mao pointed out long ago: "We Chinese have the determination to recover our lost territory by our own efforts, and the ability to stand on our own feet in the family of nations," and we are certainly able to "build a brand-new strong and prosperous People's Republic in name as well as fact." However, the chieftains of the revisionist line within the Party, Liu Shao-ch'i and Lin Piao, knelt at the feet of imperialism and social-imperialism, as they were bent on taking old China's semi-colonial road. Liu Shao-ch'i openly declared: "Our door is open to all." "If in future imperialism should come to China to open mines and factories, share the profits with us on an equal basis and work to our mutual advantage, it may be permitted to do so."* This, in reality, was a reprint of Chiang Kai-shek's traitorous line of "open door" and "equal distribution of profits." Lin Piao also attacked Chairman Mao's policy of self-reliance, trumpeted the "powerful role of external conditions," and openly called for "relying on others," that is, imperialism and social-imperialism. People like Liu Shao-ch'i and Lin Piao were basically blind to the huge role of the masses of people in creating history and to the unlimited wisdom and strength of the Chinese people who have held the destiny of their country in their hands. They did not believe that what could be done by the Western bourgeoisie could also be done by the Eastern proletariat. In their view, the Chinese people could not survive unless they begged imperialism for help, and therefore were faced with only one choice: to invite the big foreigners to come back. Liu Shao-ch'i brazenly declared: Imperialism "simply has to find its compradores in China, and we may work for them as compradores, in this case Red compradores!"** What a "Red comprador"! Peddling the black goods of the slavish comprador philosophy under the "Red" trade mark -- this is precisely a characteristic of the revisionists within the Party in worshipping foreign things and fawning upon foreigners under the conditions of proletarian dictatorship.

---

* Quoted from the article "The Road of China's Socialist Industrialization."

** Quoted from the article "Smash the Slavish Comprador Philosophy and Develop the Shipbuilding Industry on a Large Scale."

When we uphold the policy of "independence and initiative" and "self-reliance," it does not mean that we reject the study and importation of foreign advanced experience and technical equipment. The question is: Do we "make foreign things serve China" with a view to catching up with and overtaking them? Or do we copy them blindly and crawl behind others at a snail's pace? Liu Shao-ch'i looked upon Western science and technology as something beyond our reach and the foreign capitalist dogmas as something sacred. "A tortoise in front is crawling to find a way out, and a tortoise behind is crawling after it."* This remark by Liu Shao-ch'i most graphically depicts his face as a compradore who willingly crawls behind the foreigners. Liu Shao-ch'i's attitude toward the shipbuilding industry is an outstanding example. Once he publicly proposed that for the shipbuilding industry "the First Five-Year Plan is to follow the rules of thumb, and the Second Five-Year Plan is still to do the same."** People did not find this strange for it was but a reprint of "doing everything according to the rules of thumb" advocated by the Yang Wu group in those years. Liu Shao-ch'i even felt that it might take too much energy to crawl behind others in this way, so he sang the tune that "building ships is no better than buying them, and buying them is no better than chartering them."** This prompted him to favor buying and chartering foreign ships with gold and foreign exchange in an attempt to strangle China's shipbuilding industry, undermine our naval defense construction, and continue to place our shipping transportation industry in the hands of the imperialists as it was before the liberation. Compared with the fallacy that "building ships is no better than buying them" trumpeted by the Yang Wu group in those years, Liu Shao-ch'i's "cultivation" in the slavish comprador philosophy and national capitulation can be said to "surpass one's master in learning."

Chairman Mao points out: "Revisionism has an international character. It is impossible for one to practice revisionism in China without allying oneself with international revisionism." With a view to pushing the revisionist line in China, Liu Shao-ch'i and Lin Piao had no choice but to lean to Soviet revisionist social-imperialism, and to trumpet the slavish comprador philosophy and capitulationism was precisely to serve this counter-revolutionary political line. In 1960, the Soviet revisionist renegade clique blatantly tore up the contracts, withdrew its experts, and openly embarked on the road of opposing China, Communism and the people. But still Liu Shao-ch'i brazenly praised the "achievements" of Soviet revisionist science and technology, and absurdly proposed to "seriously study" the Soviet revisionist "experience in socialist construction." He slandered our Party as "being satisfied with half-baked knowledge, thinking that it knows many things, and so it becomes lazy in study."*** Thus he fully revealed his

---

* Quoted from the article "Smash the Foreign Comprador Philosophy and Develop the Shipbuilding Industry on a Large Scale."

** Ibid.

*** "Speech at the Rally Celebrating the 40th Anniversary of the Founding of the Chinese Communist Party."

features as a lackey of the Soviet revisionists. The renegade and traitor Lin Piao was so frightened by the nuclear blackmail of the Soviet revisionists that, in his eyes, the Soviet revisionists, these colossuses, must under no circumstances be offended. He did his best to peddle the sinister Confucian stuff such as "a small state should imitate a large" and "when a small state serves a large, it will be treated generously by the latter." Thus, the relationships between a large state and a small one and between a strong state and a weak one were described as those between the rulers and the ruled, the masters and slaves. According to this logic, China could do nothing but to meekly become a colony of Soviet revisionist social-imperialism before it could obtain peace and tranquility. This is an out-and-out philosophy of a lackey, a philosophy which precisely forms an important ideological basis for Lin Piao to launch the counter-revolutionary armed coup d'etat. He vainly attempted to ascend the throne as a junior emperor with the help of the Soviet revisionists' "nuclear umbrella." The result was that his conspiracy failed and he had to flee in panic and met his despicable end totally discredited.

Chairman Mao says: "Rely mainly on our own efforts while making external assistance subsidiary, break down blind faith, go in for industry, agriculture and technical and cultural revolutions independently, do away with slavishness, bury dogmatism, learn from the good experience of other countries conscientiously and be sure to study their bad experience too, so as to draw lessons from it. This is our line." This is the only correct line for us to carry out socialist construction, as well as a mighty ideological weapon for us to criticize the slavish comprador philosophy. It was under the guidance of this line that we broke the imperialist blockade, resisted the social-imperialist pressure, smashed the interference of the revisionist line of Liu Shao-ch'i and Lin Piao, and insured realistic and vigorous development of the Chinese socialist economy. We must forever adhere to Chairman Mao's proletarian revolutionary line. We must continue to criticize the blind faith in foreign dogmas and the mistaken idea that the moon abroad is rounder than in China. We must eradicate the evil influence of the slavish comprador philosophy and give full play to the wisdom and creativity of the Chinese people. We must strive to build our country into a strong modern socialist country before the end of this century!

* * *

The Chinese Communist Party Is the Leader in the War of Resistance Against Japan

- with a critique of Lin Piao's anti-Party article preaching capitulationism

by

K'o Shih (柯史)

(Li-shih Yen-chiu /Historical Research/, No. 5, October 20, 1975)

The Chinese people's War of Resistance Against Japan, after traversing a road of twists and turns under the strong leadership of the Chinese Communist Party and Chairman Mao and the guidance of Chairman Mao's proletarian revolutionary line, finally attained its triumph. In the eight years of war, our Party and our army, together with the broad masses of the people throughout the country, not only carried out a life-and-death struggle with the ferocious Japanese aggressors and a sharp and complex struggle with the Kuomintang reactionaries who were passive in resisting Japan but active in opposing communism and the people, but also waged a resolute fight against the Right capitulationist line represented by Wang Ming within the Party. The victory of the war once more proves vividly that the Communist Party and Chairman Mao are the great saviors of the Chinese people, and Chairman Mao's revolutionary line is the only correct line for fighting a hundred battles and winning them all.

Chairman Mao pointed out recently: "The merit of the book Water Margin lies precisely in the portrayal of capitulation. It serves as teaching material by negative example to help all people recognize capitulationists." His important instruction concerning the criticism of Water Margin is like a mirror showing up all capitulationists. During the war, the renegade and traitor Lin Piao was a follower of Wang Ming's Right capitulationist line. In July 1940, he published abroad an article entitled "The Chinese People's 3-Year War of National Liberation." It was his representative piece preaching capitulationism. In this article, he made no reference at all to the leading role of the CCP and Chairman Mao in the war; instead, he lavishly praised the KMT and Chiang Kai-shek in an attempt to make people believe that the KMT and Chiang Kai-shek were the "leaders" in the war and that Chiang Kai-shek was a "hero" capable of leading the war to victory. This was a gross distortion of the history of the war. To criticize this anti-Party article may help us see more clearly that Lin Piao was a capitulationist in history.

I

In the anti-Japanese national united front, whether or not to uphold the leadership of the proletariat was a crucial issue determining the success or failure of the war and even the outcome of the entire new democratic revolution. It was also a crucial issue in the struggle between the two lines within the Party.

Chairman Mao has all along stressed the inevitability and necessity of leadership by the Chinese proletariat over the bourgeois-democratic revolution. As early as October 1928, in the article "Why Is It That Red Political Power Can Exist in China?" he pointed out explicitly: "China is in urgent need of a bourgeois-democratic revolution, and this revolution can be completed only under the leadership of the proletariat." Subsequently, he repeatedly explained this brilliant theme in many of his writings. He pointed out emphatically: Should we make the proletariat follow the bourgeoisie, or the bourgeoisie follow the proletariat? "This question of responsibility for the leadership of the Chinese revolution is the key issue deciding the success or failure of the revolution." In addition, Chairman Mao profoundly expounded the relationship between the current struggle of our Party and its long-range goal, stating that for us to "firmly lead the democratic revolution is a condition for winning the victory of socialism." "To unite with those elements of the bourgeoisie who favor resistance against Japan today is precisely the only bridge leading to socialism." This clearly tells us that only by firmly grasping the leadership of the united front could the CCP win the victory in the War of Resistance Against Japan, see to it that the fruits of the victory of the war belong to the people, and create the conditions for seizing nationwide power and realize socialism.

Chairman Mao pointed out: The primary condition for the proletariat to achieve, through its political party, political leadership over the various revolutionary classes in the nation "is to advance a basic political slogan in the light of the course of historical development and, with a view to fulfilling this slogan, to put forward mobilization slogans in each stage of development and in each major event." Moreover, it must "raise its own infinite enthusiasm and loyalty and become a model in achieving these specific objectives." The course of the establishment of the anti-Japanese national united front shows that the CCP was exactly such a proletarian party having this vital condition. After the Japanese imperialists intruded into our Northeast following the 1931 "September 18" incident, the CCP called on the people to carry out armed resistance and unfolded an anti-Japanese guerrilla war in the various provinces of the Northeast. In 1933, the CCP made public a declaration stating its readiness to sign an anti-Japanese pact with any KMT forces on condition that they ceased their attack on the Red Army, protected the freedom and rights of the people and armed the people. In 1935 and 1936, at a time when expanded aggression by Japanese imperialism against North China caused the national contradiction between China and Japan to rise to become the principal contradiction and major changes had already taken place in the relations between various classes inside the country, the CCP opportunely raised the basic slogan "an anti-Japanese national united front" and a "united Democratic Republic." At the same time, it also raised such mobilization slogans as "stop the civil war," "strive for democracy," and "carry out the war of resistance" as specific objectives for the united actions of the people of the whole country. Besides, it made every effort to have the "Sian incident" solved peacefully, thereby creating the conditions for fresh KMT-CCP cooperation. Subsequently, through a series of effective efforts, it finally forced

the KMT authorities to publish successively, through its news agency, the declaration of the CCP Central Committee proclaiming the inauguration of cooperation between the two parties and Chiang Kai-shek's interview recognizing the CCP's legal status. It was only in this way that the KMT-CCP united front was established. Facts show that without the leadership and protracted efforts of the CCP, it would have been impossible to establish an anti-Japanese national united front.

The anti-Japanese national united front was a united front formed by various classes on the premise of common resistance against Japan. Since it included three kinds of forces -- the left, middle and right, class struggle was unavoidable. Still on the eve of the war, Chairman Mao pointed out: "In terms of political importance, the development of the national contradiction between China and Japan has lowered the position of the contradictions between various classes and between various political groups in the country and caused them to become secondary and subordinate things. However, these contradictions still exist and have not been reduced or vanished." The fact is exactly so. The big landlord and big bourgeois classes represented by the KMT and Chiang Kai-shek formed the Right-wing group of the anti-Japanese national united front. Consistently hostile to the people, they believed that revolution (any revolution) was worse than imperialism. The reason why some of them joined the national united front temporarily was that they were forced to join and did so reluctantly, and they had always been double-dealers. They always wanted to destroy the CCP and the Red Army using the hands of the Japanese aggressors and in the name of "unity." Not long after the outbreak of the war, the KMT advanced a conspiratorial plan for "cutting the CCP strength by two-fifths during the anti-Japanese war." After the war entered the stage of stalemate, the KMT again raised such fascist slogans as "one party, one doctrine, one leader" and "unify political and military orders." It adopted such reactionary policies as "containing communism," "melting communism," and "opposing communism," and successively stirred up three anti-communist high tides, plotting to split the united front and destroy the CCP and, under its leadership, the Eighth Route Army, the New Fourth Army and the various anti-Japanese democratic base areas in preparations for surrender to Japanese imperialism. Under these circumstances, the question of upholding the proletarian leadership in the united front assumed still more special and vital significance.

With a view to upholding the proletarian leadership in the united front, Chairman Mao set forth the principle of "maintaining independence and keeping the initiative in the united front," "not only to unite with others but also remain independent." In other words, within the united front it was necessary to preserve the CCP's ideological, political and organizational independence. "Only this will benefit cooperation and make it possible to have cooperation; otherwise, cooperation will turn into a mixture and the united front will inevitably be sacrificed." Chairman Mao stressed: "To explain, practice and uphold this principle of 'independence and initiative in the united front' is the link leading the anti-Japanese national revolutionary war toward victory." To persist in the principle of independence and initiative meant that we

should not be restricted by the KMT but go beyond the scope permitted by it, mobilize the masses with a free hand, extensively establish anti-Japanese democratic base areas, vigorously develop the CCP organization, and, in particular, make an effort to expand the people's army under our Party's leadership. It was only in this way that the united front could have a central pillar and would not be dismantled by Japanese imperialism and the KMT. In the military field, it was necessary to adopt the strategic policy of "developing the guerrilla war independently and with initiative," and "while guerrilla warfare is basic, we should not neglect mobile warfare under favorable conditions." All this was aimed at consolidating and developing our positions, expanding the people's strength, and, under our Party's leadership, defeating the Japanese aggressors and building a new China.

However, the Right capitulationists represented by Wang Ming adopted an entirely different principle and stand. They basically negated the existence of class struggle in the united front and the differences in principle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie in terms of programs, policies, thinking and practice. They trusted the KMT more than the masses of the people; they were in favor of "everything through the united front," in effect, everything through the KMT. Conceding to the anti-popular policies of the KMT, they dared not freely mobilize the masses to struggle, nor did they dare freely to expand the people's army and the anti-Japanese democratic base areas. Instead, they pinned the hope for the defeat of the Japanese aggressors on the KMT army, and entrusted the destiny of the people to legal movements under the KMT reactionary rule. Militarily, they were against the strategic guidelines set by Chairman Mao for the Eighth Route Army and the New Fourth Army and called for concentrating troops for fighting a regular war in coordination with the KMT army. In short, they were for alliance and against struggle in everything, thereby handing over the leadership of the war to the KMT while willingly crawling behind the KMT. This was a downright reprint of Ch'en Tu-hsiu's capitulationism.

Chairman Mao led the whole Party to wage an uncompromising struggle against Wang Ming's capitulationist line. In November 1937, in the article "The Situation and Tasks in the Anti-Japanese War After the Fall of Shanghai and Taiyuan," he pointed out incisively: The main danger within the Party at present was class capitulationism; "it is necessary to firmly oppose capitulationism." In October 1938, in his report to the 6th Plenary Session of the 6th CCP Central Committee Chairman Mao again discussed the question of the role of the CCP in the national war, calling on all comrades of the Party to conscientiously take up our Party's tremendous historical responsibility of leading the War of Resistance Against Japan while at the same time systematically explaining our Party's line and policies in directing the armed struggle independently and with initiative and criticizing in an all-round and penetrating manner the erroneous theory and practice of Wang Ming's capitulationism. A death sentence was pronounced on this wrong line.

However, Lin Piao obstinately stuck to Wang Ming's capitulationist line, doing all he could to revive the soul of this wrong line. In

his anti-Party article published abroad, on the one hand he deliberately confused the distinctions between revolution and counter-revolution in the 10-year agrarian revolutionary war in an attempt to absolve the KMT of its traitorous and reactionary civil war policies. On the other hand, he wilfully advocated that "all progressive forces in the country should rally around the Central Government headed by the supreme commander Chiang Kai-shek," and that "all Chinese armies should be subordinate" to that "united command headquarters" under Chiang Kai-shek. In this, he sang the same tune as the KMT, which clamored for "unifying political and military orders," and Wang Ming, who proposed to "make everything go through the united front."

Chairman Mao long ago saw through the essence of the "unity" tricks played by Chiang Kai-shek. Hitting the nail on the head, he pointed out: That was "exercising dictatorial power in the name of unity," "to wipe out the Communist Party, the Eighth Route Army, the New Fourth Army and the democratic anti-Japanese base areas and to wipe out all local anti-Japanese forces, so that everything is unified under the Kuomintang." As for the preposterous slogan "everything through the united front" proposed by Wang Ming, Chairman Mao also thoroughly refuted it long ago. He stated: The KMT was the ruling party, and its policy was to restrict our development. Under these circumstances, to raise the "everything through the united front" slogan "can only bind ourselves hand and foot, and this is something we shouldn't do at all." However, Lin Piao blatantly went against these assertions made by Chairman Mao, and following behind the KMT and Wang Ming, clamored for "unity" for the evil purpose of tying us hand and foot and making the CCP follow the KMT. This was a big exposure of his ugly features as a class capitulationist.

II

The leadership of the War of Resistance Against Japan was most basically political leadership, that is, leadership in line and policies. In the 8-year war, two diametrically opposite lines existed from beginning to end in the country: One was the line of total resistance upheld by the CCP, namely, the line of people's war; the other was the line of partial resistance followed by the KMT, that is, the line of opposing the people's war and passively resisting Japan. To maintain the proletarian leadership within the united front, Communists must resolutely follow our Party's line of total resistance and firmly oppose the KMT's line of partial resistance.

As soon as the War of Resistance Against Japan erupted, Chairman Mao, on behalf of the CCP, put to the whole nation a "Ten-Point Program for Resisting Japan and Saving the Nation" for a war of total resistance. He stressed: Our central task was to "mobilize all forces to win the victory of the war of resistance." To this end, "we must give up the policy of letting the government carry on resistance alone, and pursue a policy of waging a general war of national resistance." "Only by waging a general war of national resistance can we thoroughly defeat the Japanese aggressors." However, the KMT reactionaries, who represented the interests

of the big landlord and big bourgeois classes, were afraid of the people arising to act and were afraid of the democratic movement. They represented the masses of the people and prevented them from participating in the war of resistance. They simply relied on their government and army to carry out a war of passive resistance. This reactionary line actually helped the Japanese aggressors endanger the war of resistance and led to reverses in war, the loss of a large part of territory, a financial and economic crisis, the oppression and sufferings of the people, and the disruption of the national unity.

Chairman Mao pointed out: The line of total resistance and that of partial resistance, "herein lies the difference in principle between the stand of the Communist Party and the present stand of the Kuomintang with regard to resistance. If Communists forget this difference in principle, they will be unable to guide the War of Resistance correctly, they will be powerless to overcome the Kuomintang's one-sidedness, and they will debase themselves to the point of abandoning their principles and reduce their Party to the level of the Kuomintang." The Right capitulationists represented by Wang Ming, however, did not recognize this difference in principle. They accommodated the KMT in every way and vainly attempted to reduce the CCP to the level where it could meet the needs of the KMT's landlord-bourgeois class dictatorship and partial resistance. Chairman Mao sharply refuted this erroneous view, pointing out: "Our united front with the Kuomintang and other parties is based on the execution of a definite program. Without this basis there can be no united front, and in that case cooperation would become unprincipled and a manifestation of capitulationism."

Lin Piao also spared no effort in following Wang Ming to accommodate KMT's line of partial resistance. In his anti-Party article published abroad, he did his best to cover up the KMT's line of partial resistance and cited a lot of deceptive propaganda spread by military and political leaders of the KMT and newspapers in playing up the so-called "war exploits" of the KMT army as well as the so-called "political achievements" of the KMT government in a futile bid to prove that the KMT's line of resistance was "correct" and it was capable of leading the war to "victory." But historical facts can be changed by no one.

In 1935, Chairman Mao had already pointed out: The CCP and the Red Army "will surely become strong pillars in the future anti-Japanese government and anti-Japanese army." When the war broke out, the Eighth Route Army and the New Fourth Army under our Party's leadership swiftly advanced to the anti-Japanese front in accordance with Chairman Mao's line and strategic policies for a people's war. Behind the enemy lines, they actively mobilized and armed the masses, extensively developed guerrilla warfare, established anti-Japanese base areas, namely, the liberated areas, and posed a serious threat to the Japanese aggressive army. This forced the Japanese aggressors to abandon their strategic policy of winning quick victories and fight a protracted war with us. In the meantime, the revolutionary forces under our Party's leadership developed rapidly in the course of struggle. By 1940, we had liberated areas and guerrilla zones with a total population of one hundred million,

and the Eighth Route Army and the New Fourth Army developed into a force with nearly half a million men, while the militia developed into a force with two million men. The guerrilla forces in South China also developed. At this time, our army already engaged 58 percent of the Japanese aggressive army and over 90 percent of the puppet troops. The theater of war in the liberated areas then became the main theater of war in China. Just as Chairman Mao pointed out, "The armed forces and the masses of people led by the Communist Party have become the central pillars in the anti-Japanese war."

Things were entirely different in the KMT's theater of war. After the anti-Japanese war erupted, the KMT troops faced with the advancing Japanese aggressors, were either routed quickly or fled in panic without putting up a fight. In a period of 15 months from the Lukouchiao Incident of July 1937 to the fall of Wuhan in October 1938, the KMT army lost half of the land of the mother country, and from North, East and Central China retreated to the Southwest and Northwest. From then on, the Japanese aggressors began to concentrate their main forces to deal with the CCP and, under its leadership, the Eighth Route Army and the New Fourth Army, while to the KMT they adopted a policy of mainly inducing political surrender supplemented by military actions. Under these circumstances, the KMT became increasingly reactionary and more passive in its resistance, and the heavy burden of the war was shifted entirely to the liberated areas. They even went so far as to collaborate with the Japanese aggressors in repeatedly launching military offensives against the liberated areas. Meanwhile, large groups of important KMT military and political officials, senior generals and troops surrendered to the enemy and became puppet troops directly coordinating with the Japanese aggressors in attacks against the liberated areas. Those KMT troops who did not surrender, when attacked by the Japanese aggressors, abandoned cities and land, and were so badly beaten that they could not be reorganized, like a basket of eggs which could be smashed by the touch of one finger. The crisis facing the KMT theater of war was averted and the protracted war of resistance was sustained only because the liberated areas under our Party's leadership attracted the main forces of the Japanese army around their peripheries. This was an historical fact Lin Piao could not change, however hard he might try.

Lin Piao also showed himself to be a despicable liar when he drummed up the so-called "political achievements" of the KMT government. Below, let us make a point-by-point analysis.

Lin Piao said: "A huge amount of work has been done" in such fields as "mobilizing the masses of people to join the army under the leadership of the National Government." This was a fabrication, pure and simple. As everyone knows, "general mobilization of the people of the whole country" was part of the important content of the "Ten-Point Program for Resisting Japan and Saving the Nation" proposed by our Party. It called upon the "people over the length and breadth of China to mobilize and arm themselves, participate in the war of resistance, and contribute whatever they have -- their strength, money, guns and knowledge." This was completely fulfilled in the various anti-Japanese democratic

base areas under our Party's leadership. There the masses of people actively joined the army and participated in the war. The forces of the people were closely combined with the forces of the army to launch an extensive guerrilla war and deal harsh blows to the enemy. However, the KMT government, representing the interests of the big landlord and big bourgeois classes, carried out a series of reactionary policies to suppress the people. Far from being capable of mobilizing the masses of people to join the army, it could only reinforce its army by press-ganging and buying soldiers. However, Lin Piao arbitrarily put makeup on the KMT, describing "pressganging" as "mobilizing the masses of people to join the army." If this were not a big lie, what else could it be?

Lin Piao said: The establishment of such bodies as the "People's Political Council" was "a most important factor for the democratization of China's political system." What was the "People's Political Council"? It was an advisory body the KMT was forced to establish after the outbreak of the War of Resistance Against Japan. Members of the council were "invited" by the KMT government. Although in form it included representatives from many parties, those from the KMT predominated and the resolutions it adopted had no binding power on the KMT government. It was obvious that such a "Political Council" was merely an instrument of the KMT reactionaries, a decoration of the landlord-bourgeois class dictatorship. In the article "New-Democratic Constitutional Government," Chairman Mao pointed out: "China lacks many things, but the main ones are independence and democracy." "The principal demands of the nation today are for independence and democracy." Dealing with the deceptive propaganda of the KMT about the so-called "constitutional government," Chairman Mao, hitting the nail on the head, pointed out: "They display the sheep's head of constitutional government while selling the dog-meat of one-party dictatorship." The fact that Lin Piao arbitrarily said that the KMT government "democratized China's political system" can only show that he was a faithful running dog of the landlord and bourgeois classes.

Lin Piao said: The KMT government "has achieved not a few achievements in economic construction." This likewise was a fabrication. As everyone knows, the KMT bureaucrats and warlords -- particularly the four big families of Chiang Kai-shek, Sung Tzu-wen /T. V. Sung/, K'ung Hsiang-hsi /H. H. Kung/ and the Ch'en brothers, Li-fu and Kuo-fu -- were all experts on making fortunes by taking advantage of national disasters. The military service, public bonds, the unified economic control and relief for the victims of natural calamities and refugees all provided the opportunities for them to acquire wealth. This group of insatisfiable tigers and wolves recklessly accumulated bureaucrat capital, monopolized China's economic lifeline and caused serious damage to the national economy, thus making the already weak national power even weaker. When Lin Piao tried his utmost to cover up these crimes of the KMT government and arbitrarily said it "has achieved not a few achievements" in economic construction, how absurd he was!

Lin Piao said: The KMT government "has also taken certain measures to improve the condition of the peasant and worker masses" in order to "raise the living standard of the working people." This, too, confused black with white. The actual fact was: the aims -- as embodied in our Party's "Ten-Point Program for Resisting Japan and Saving the Nation" -- of improving the lot of the workers, employees, teachers and anti-Japanese soldiers, giving preferential treatment to dependents of anti-Japanese soldiers, abolishing the harsh taxes and levies, reducing rent and interest, providing unemployment relief, adjusting the supply of grain and supplying relief to areas stricken with natural calamities were completely fulfilled only in the liberated areas under our Party's leadership. The KMT government did not fulfill any of these aims; instead, it took a series of unpopular measures to further fleece the people. Rents and interest rates were high, and there were a host of harsh taxes and levies. Corruption was rife among government officials, who used their positions to engage in profiteering. This caused broken homes for the millions and millions of the working people struggling on the verge of death. Lin Piao, however, did nothing at all to expose these bloody facts; instead, he did everything he could to praise the KMT government about how it "improved the living standard of the working people." He was indeed worthy of being called a pious scion of the landlord-bourgeois classes.

By so energetically playing up the KMT's so-called "war exploits" and "political achievements," Lin Piao's criminal purpose was to embellish the KMT's line of partial and passive resistance and to serve his own class capitulationism. This precisely met the needs of the KMT and those of Japanese imperialism as well.

III

Throughout the War of Resistance Against Japan, particularly after its entry into the stage of stalemate, an adverse current existed which distinguished the KMT for its capitulation, split and regression. There was no alternative for Communists to firmly beat back this adverse current if they were to uphold the proletarian leadership in the united front and carry the war through to the end.

After the fall of Wuhan in October 1938, the Japanese imperialists stepped up their political activities to induce the KMT to surrender. Meanwhile, the British and American imperialists, for their own interests, also intensified their activities to persuade the KMT to surrender. In these circumstances, the KMT government, which had from the first exhibited a serious tendency toward compromise and which had all along made secret deals with the Japanese imperialists, now whipped up throughout the country an anti-communist, anti-popular adverse current in favor of capitulation, split and regression. Militarily, the KMT fought the Japanese passively in order to preserve its own military strength. While letting the Japanese aggressors mount massive attacks against the liberated areas, it "sits on the mountain to watch tigers fight." Politically, the KMT intensified its drive against communism and the people. In March 1939 the KMT Central Committee secretly issued "Measures for Restricting

Activities of Alien Parties" and in October "Measures for Handling the Question of Alien Parties." So, voices for "restricting communism," "melting communism" and "opposing communism" formed a rising crescendo and became more persistent throughout the country. The KMT set all its propaganda machines in motion, wilfully slandering the CCP and the people's army and liberated areas under its leadership and even openly clamoring for abolishing the CCP, the Eighth Route Army, the New Fourth Army and the Shensi-Kansu-Ninghsia border region. At the same time, it drove underground all democratic parties and groups, particularly the CCP, in the areas under its rule, and carted a large number of progressive youth to concentration camps. More seriously, losing all its senses it created a series of anti-communist bloody incidents and flagrantly mounted a succession of military attacks on the people's army led by our Party in a vain attempt to wipe out the staunchest armed forces in resisting Japan and pave the way for surrender to the Japanese aggressors.

How were we to deal with this adverse current sitrred up by the KMT diehards? At that time two different attitudes existed within our Party. In view of the dual nature of the KMT diehards, Chairman Mao decided to deal with them with revolutionary dual tactics. In other words, they should be kept in the anti-Japanese united front for as long as it was possible, while an uncompromising struggle should be waged in the ideological, political and military fields against their reactionary policy of undermining the progressive forces on a nationwide scale. This was a policy of both alliance and struggle, a policy of seeking unity through struggle. Under the guidance of this policy, in its 1939 "July 7 Declaration" our Party put forward three big political slogans as the objectives for common struggle by all patriotic elements throughout the country. These slogans were "persist in the war of resistance, and oppose capitulation," "adhere to unity, and oppose split," and "uphold progress, and oppose regression." Under the guidance of this policy, our Party also formulated the policy of "developing the progressive forces, winning over the intermediate forces, and isolating the anti-communist diehard forces." It formulated, during the struggle against the anti-communist diehards, the principle of "making use of contradictions, winning over the majority, opposing the minority and attacking them one by one" and "with reason, advantage and restraint." Militarily it adopted the strict stand of self-defense: "We shall not attack if we are not attacked; we shall surely attack if we are attacked." However, the Right capitulationists represented by Wang Ming, accommodating the big landlord and big bourgeois classes and the KMT, were willing to have their hands and feet tied, not daring to carry out a struggle against the KMT' reactionary policy of undermining the progressive forces nor daring to develop the progressive forces with a free hand. Under Chairman Mao's leadership, our Party and army waged an uncompromising struggle against Wang Ming's Right capitulationist line; at the same time, in accordance with the guidelines, policies and principles laid down by Chairman Mao and the Party Central Committee, they resolutely exposed the various conspiracies of the KMT diehards, smashed all their attacks and provocations, and frustrated their attempt to split the united front and surrender to Japanese imperialism. In the course of the struggle, our Party determinedly expanded the liberated areas and the people's army,

thereby guaranteeing not only our defeat of Japanese imperialism but also that when the KMT launched an all-out counter-revolutionary war after the surrender of Japan, we would be able smoothly to shift into the orbit of a people's war of liberation and in a short time secure the defeat of Chiang Kai-shek and the great victory in the war to liberate the whole of China.

However, at a time when the whole Party and the whole army, guided by Chairman Mao's revolutionary line, were dealing heavy blows to the KMT's capitulationist, splittist and regressive activities, Lin Piao in his anti-Party article did his best to absolve the KMT and Chiang Kai-shek of their crimes. On the one hand, he said nonsensically that the capitulationist, splittist and regressive activities were carried out only by certain persons under Chiang Kai-shek and "representatives of local governments," many of whom were elements who "have gone astray and are wavering." On the other hand, he embellished the KMT government headed by Chiang Kai-shek, saying that the KMT government "refused to surrender despite all difficulties." In this way he absolved the KMT and Chiang Kai-shek of all crimes they perpetrated in carrying out the capitulationist, splittist and regressive activities. After his return to China in early 1942, Lin Piao continued to say in Lanchow and Yenan that the KMT and we were "unanimous" in "opinions on the affairs of the state," and that the KMT and Chiang Kai-shek were "sincere in seeking peace." Moreover, he openly accused our Party of failing to conduct the negotiations with the KMT properly. All these were nothing but shameless lies designed to distort historical facts. As Chairman Mao pointed out long ago, the principal ruling clique of the KMT headed by Chiang Kai-shek represented the interests of the big landlord and big bourgeois classes and they were the big headquarters of national capitulationism; to surrender, they must first oppose the Communists and split the anti-Japanese national united front. Isn't this precisely the case? Can the above iron-clad facts be changed at will?

Lin Piao's anti-Party article was released after our Party had already criticized Wang Ming's Right capitulationist line. Its spearhead was directed at our Party's line and policies for leading the armed struggle independently and with initiative, and its essence was to reverse the verdict passed on Wang Ming's Right capitulationist line. At the same time, it also served the policies of the KMT and Chiang Kai-shek concerning their attempts to control the CCP as well as restricting and weakening our army and the anti-Japanese democratic base areas, in effect, "to lead the proletariat to satisfy the private interests of the bourgeoisie and its party." Chairman Mao pointed out: "In the anti-Japanese national revolutionary war, class capitulationism is in reality a reserve force of national capitulationism, the most hideous tendency which aids the Right-wing camp and leads the war to defeat." Lin Piao's class capitulationism covered up the KMT's capitulationist activities and in the final analysis also served the aggressive policies of Japanese imperialism in subjugating China and turning it into a colony. Such was the essence of Lin Piao's anti-Party article.

At present, the whole Party, the whole army and the people of the whole country are penetratingly studying Chairman Mao's important instruction on the question of theory, actively unfolding criticism of and discussion on Water Margin, and criticizing the capitulationist line preached by the novel. To review the history of the two-line struggle within the Party during the period of the anti-Japanese war and criticize Lin Piao's anti-Party article preaching capitulationism is a matter of tremendous significance for us in studying theory well, combating and preventing revisionism, strengthening the preparations against war and consolidating the dictatorship of the proletariat. We must closely unite around the Party Central Committee headed by Chairman Mao, steadfastly adhere to the Party's basic line, study theory well, make a success of criticism, and further implement Chairman Mao's directive concerning stability and unity. We must "grasp revolution, promote production, promote work and preparations against war," and offer our all to socialist revolution and socialist construction.

* * *

A Live Specimen of the Great Russian Chauvinism

- Comment on "China's Modern History" edited by Tikhvinskiy

by

Sung Pin (宋斌)

(Li-shih Yen-chiu /Historical Research/, No.5, October 20, 1975)

World domination was a goal tsarist Russia never changed nor neglected. And Russian chauvinism was a whip it used to pursue world domination.

Today, the renegades entrenched in the Kremlin are dreaming the old dream of the old tsars for dominating the world. Their appetite is greater than that of the old tsars, and they have gone further as well. History seems to be repeating itself. The departed soul of great Russian chauvinism is again worshipped on the literary altar in Moscow.

Edited by Tikhvinskiy (齐赫文斯基), a man of letters in the pay of the Soviet revisionists, the book China's Modern History (published by Soviet Science Publishing House, 1972 edition) is a live specimen of great Russian chauvinism and superpower hegemonism. As reading material about China's modern history, it is entirely worthless as it is made up of rubbish gathered from here and there, confuses right and wrong and contains numerous errors. However, insofar as we want to understand the truth about the prevalence of Russian chauvinist tunes in the Soviet Union today and its reactionary essence, the book is unique teaching material by negative example.

A Complete Betrayal of the Marxist Doctrine on the National Question

Today, the reactionary bourgeois racial theory is gaining wide circulation in Moscow, and becomes the theoretical basis for increasing numbers of cheap publications on history and literature. This book edited by Tikhvinskiy is but one example.

According to the reasoning of the editor, the main content and principal characteristics of China's modern history were the conquest and rule of China by the Manchu nationality and the anti-Manchu struggle carried out by the Han nationality with its great Han nationalism and other nationalities. The reason why the beginning of China's modern history was advanced to the year 1644 was that in that year the Ch'ing Dynasty with a Manchu as emperor succeeded Ming with a Han as emperor."*

---

* See the book, pp. 5-7.

Tikhvinskiy and associates swore in affected earnestness: "Members who took part in the collective writing of this book follow the directives of Marxist-Leninist classical writers in the course of studying China's modern history." However, such a beautiful oath cannot cover up their complete betrayal of Marxism-Leninism.

Marxism-Leninism holds that the national question, in the final analysis, is a matter of class struggle. National relations have never gone beyond class relations, still less can they be used to divide the periods of history.

Lenin pointed out: "To discuss national sentiments as an independent factor is to obliterate the essence of the question."* By describing the contradiction between the Manchu and the Han as the principal characteristic and main content of China's modern history and taking 1644 as the year that marked beginning of China's modern history, Tikhvinskiy and associates obliterate the essence of the question from two aspects: First, they basically negate the different character of the Middle Ages society and the modern society; second, they basically negate the real national question of colonies and semi-colonies.

As long as more than two thousand years ago, China was already a multi-national, unitary country. In the prolonged feudal society there were many dynastic changes. Members of other nationalities besides the Han many times became the founders of new dynasties. In the latter part of Ming, the Manchus, as the subjects of Ming, gradually became strong and founded the Ch'ing Dynasty. In 1644 they formally replaced Ming and quickly unified the whole country. This was one new feudal dynasty replacing another without any changes in both the character of society and the class character of the state political structure. The principal contradiction in society was not that between the Manchus and the Hans but that between the landlord class and the broad masses of the peasantry. Although they are well aware of this, Tikhvinskiy and associates arbitrarily take the year 1644 as the opening year of China's modern history. Haven't they openly betrayed the Marxist principle on the division of the periods of history, deliberately covered up the class contradictions in feudal society and emasculated the class content of modern society?

In the semi-colonial, semi-feudal society, the national contradiction indeed rose to become the principal contradiction. However, it was different from that discussed by Tikhvinskiy. The bourgeoisie of the Western capitalist countries frantically engaged in external colonial expansion, trying its best to transform the world in its own image and with the method of terror. "Just as it has made the country dependent on the towns, so it has made barbarian and semi-barbarian

---

* "What the 'Friends of the People' Are and How They Fight the Social-Democrats," Selected Works of Lenin, Vol. I, p. 22.

countries dependent on the civilized ones, nations of peasants on nations of bourgeoisie, the East on the West."* The Western bourgeoisie took the colonies and semi-colonies into its world capitalist system, causing these countries and regions to begin their modern history. The Western bourgeoisie also turned the people of colonies and semi-colonies into oppressed nations, and their own nations into oppressing nations, thereby making the contradiction between these two kinds of opposing nations the principal contradiction in colonial and semi-colonial countries and regions. This contradiction was essentially the contradiction between the masses of people in colonies and semi-colonies on the one side and the ruling class, the bourgeoisie, of Western capitalist countries on the other.

Take China for example. Beginning with the Opium War of 1840, it gradually turned into a semi-colonial, semi-feudal society. Just as Marx pointed out: "By its kindness England forced China to formally initiate its opium trade, and used big guns to blow open the Chinese wall."** "For eight years the oldest and the most consolidated empire in the world found itself on the eve of social change under the influence of a huge quantity of printed cloth of the British capitalists, and this social change will surely bring the most important consequences to the civilization of this country."*** It was precisely with this historical event as the mark that China began its own modern history. Since then, the contradiction between imperialism and the Chinese nation and the contradiction between feudalism and the masses of the people became the principal contradictions in Chinese society, the former being the most important contradiction among the various contradictions. At this moment, all the members of the Chinese nation, not only the Han but also the Manchu, the Mongol, the Hui, Tibetan, Uighur, Chuang and other minority nationalities, were similarly trampled underfoot by the Western capitalist powers and became oppressed nationalities. To achieve liberation, the people of various nationalities in our country had to unite in a joint struggle to overthrow the rule of the imperialists and their running dogs in China. As a matter of fact, the successive revolutionary movements of the Chinese people in modern times were all joint struggles waged by the people of various nationalities. The spectacular T'ien-p'ing T'ien-kuo revolution was jointly carried out by the peasants of the Han, Chuang and Yao nationalities, and they were joined by the people of other minority nationalities such as the Hui, Miao, Yi and T'ung nationalities.

---

* "Communist Manifesto," Selected Works of Marx and Engels, Vol. I, p. 255.

** "Europe's Financial Crisis -- Fragments of the History of Currency Circulation," Collected Works of Marx and Engels, Vol. XII, p. 73.

*** "International Commentaries (1)," Collected Works of Marx and Engels, Vol. VII, p. 265.

The world-shaking I Ho Tuan Movement was a great anti-imperialist and patriotic struggle in which the people of various nationalities including the Han, Manchu, Mongol, Hoche and Olunchun nationalities participated. The revolution of 1911 was no exception either; those who participated included members of various nationalities in China. In modern times, the people of various nationalities in China, suffering from double oppression by imperialism and feudalism, shared a common fate and in common struggle pushed ahead the great cause of national liberation and people's revolution. Such are the essence and main stream of the national question in modern China.

Tikhvinskiy and associates deliberately obliterate the class content of the historical epochs as well as cover up and distort the essence of the national question of colonies and semi-colonies to meet the needs of the policies of Soviet revisionist social-imperialism. Lenin pointed out: "The central question ought to be the division of nations into the oppressing and oppressed nations. Such division is determined by the nature of imperialism, but social-chauvinists and Kautsky are so hypocritical as to avoid discussing it."* With Brezhnev as the general representative, a small handful of Soviet revisionist monopoly oligarchs are now making every effort to turn the great Russians into the biggest oppressing nation both inside the Soviet Union and in the world. At home they frantically push the policy of Russianization and genocide toward the minority nationalities and turning Russia once again into a national prison. Externally, they enslave Eastern Europe, threaten Western Europe, and place the strategic focus of contention in Europe. They are going all out to seize the Middle East and stretch out their hands to various parts of the world, besides wanting to swallow up China, a piece of fat meat. They dream of becoming the supreme ruler of the seas and pursue the "gunboat policy" of the old colonialists in various parts of the world. The contradiction between Soviet revisionist social-imperialism and the enslaved, oppressed, controlled and bullied people of various nationalities both inside and outside the Soviet Union is daily intensifying. The fact that Tikhvinskiy and associates describe the principal contradiction in modern Chinese society as that between the Manchu and the Han in order to cover up the contradiction between imperialism including tsarist Russia and the Chinese nation shows more than anything else that they have fallen to the feet of the social-chauvinists and Kautsky, that they are creating counter-revolutionary public opinion for Soviet revisionist social-imperialism to carry out aggression, expansion, interference and subversion against China and other countries.

---

* "The Revolutionary Proletariat and the Right of National Self-Determination," Complete Works of Lenin, Vol. XXI, p. 388.

Insidious Enemies of National Liberation Movements

When the imperialist powers came to the East, on the one hand they created a small handful of compradores and lackeys to serve imperialism and on the other, created their own numberous grave diggers. For this reason, wherever there is imperialist national oppression, anti-imperialist struggle for national liberation is inevitable. What attitude one should take toward these national liberation struggles is a touchstone distinguishing proletarian internationalism and social-chauvinism. To positively support these oppressed nations to rise up to fight the oppressing nations and their running dogs -- this is the proletarian internationalist attitude. To adopt double-dealing tactics in dealing with national liberation movements, to give oral support to the resistance and struggle of oppressed nations while actually trying by all possible means to slander and undermine them and to defend and expand the neo-colonialist domination -- this is the typical social-chauvinist attitude. In face of this touchstone, the Soviet revisionist renegade clique fully reveals itself as the most insidious enemy of national liberation movements.

Chairman Mao points out explicitly: "This history of China's transformation into a semi-colony and colony by imperialism in collusion with Chinese feudalism is at the same time a history of struggle by the Chinese people against imperialism and its lackeys." And he added: "Thanks to the Chinese people's unrelenting and heroic struggle during the last hundred years, imperialism has not been able to subjugate China, nor will it ever be able to do so."* Such is a revolutionary, scientific generalization of the course of development of China's modern history. However, under the pens of Tikhvinskiy and associates, history has been reversed in this way: In the peasant war of T'ai-p'ing T'ien-kuo, / we / "have not found any intention to directly fight the aggression by external powers."** The I Ho Tuan Movement was "utterly conservative and ignorant" and "completely negated European culture and the latest scientific achievements."*** The Revolution of 1911, the "central event of China's modern history," was also merely a narrow-minded movement with "clearcut anti-Manchu colors" and was not against imperialism. What followed this revolution was merely the "growth of the great Han nationalism, chauvinism and the idea of exclusiveness."**

---

* "The Chinese Revolution and the Chinese Communist Party," Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung, p. 595.

** B.H. Nikifrov (尼基福罗夫), "Book Review: China's Modern History," Soviet Modern and Contemporary History No. 4, 1973.

*** See the book China's Modern History, p. 342.

These words amply demonstrate the strong hatred Soviet revisionist social-imperialism cherishes against the anti-imperialist struggle of the Chinese people over the last hundred years.

Is it true that the T'ai-p'ing T'ien-kuo revolution had "no intention to directly fight the aggression by external powers"? Long ago, in his famous article "The Chinese Revolution and European Revolution" Marx pointed out incisively that it was British guns, opium and commodity competition that caused the outbreak of this Chinese revolution. Long before the eruption of the T'ai-p'ing T'ien-kuo revolution, Hung Hsiu-ch'üan stated solemnly: As between countries, "each should preserve its own property and must not encroach on that of others." When its capital was established in T'ienching in 1853, the British, French and American ambassadors went there to have a look, but the T'ai-p'ing T'ien-kuo revolutionaries maintained a just stand and upheld the Chinese dignity. These aggressors immediately discovered that the revolutionaries "are most unlikely" to recognize the unequal treaties the Ch'ing government had signed with the foreign powers. When the foreign aggressors finally tore up their "neutral" masks and started armed intervention against the T'ai-p'ing army, the revolutionary heroes, faced with foreign guns, fought a bloody war, taking the places of those who fell before them and demonstrating a fearless heroic spirit. This revolution was strangled by the capitalist powers. Before his execution, Hung Jen-kan said painfully: "The source of harm to our dynasty comes from foreigners helping the evil forces."* The martyrs of the T'ai-p'ing T'ien-kuo revolution died with deep regret for this. How can the men of letters in the employ of the Soviet revisionists use lies to cover up these facts written by the revolutionary martyrs with their blood?

The vicious vilification of the I Ho Tuan Movement was not unknown to the Chinese people. Some 75 years ago, when 200,000 Russian troops marched into China like beasts, burned and killed and vainly attempted to establish a "Yellow Russia," the Russian press whipped up a wave of anti-China cries characteristic of Russian chauvinism. They said that "the barbarian Chinese are hostile to European culture and civilization," that Russia shouldered the "mission as the disseminator of civilization," and so on and so forth. To whip up hatred against China among the people, scholars in the pay of the old tsars wrote so much that their fingers became swollen. The Soviet revisionist renegade clique of today is merely harping on an old tune. The great teacher of revolution, Lenin, long ago sternly refuted these shameless fabrications, pointing out: "Yes, the Chinese hate the Europeans. But what kind of Europeans do they hate? Why do they hate them? The Chinese do not hate the European people, for there is no conflict between them. Those they hate are European capitalists and the various European governments which follow the orders of capitalists." Lenin also pointed out profoundly: Why did the tsarist "government carry out such a blatant policy toward China?

---

* "Hung Jen-kan's Memoirs."

Whom does this policy benefit? It benefits a small handful of capitalist bigwigs who do business with China, a small handful of factory owners who produce for the Asian market, a small handful of contractors who reap huge profits from urgent military orders.... This policy benefits a small handful of aristocrats who combine important military and political positions."* Are these remarks not entirely applicable to the new tsars of today?

As for the saying that the Revolution of 1911 was a narrow-minded struggle against the Manchus, it also is not a new invention of Tikhvinskiy and associates. In 1949, this tune was already sung by the then American Secretary of State Acheson, who told a pack of lies about China's modern history. Refuting these lies, Chairman Mao pointed out at that time: "The Revolution of 1911 was directed against imperialism. The Chinese directed the revolution against the Ch'ing regime because it was the running dog of imperialism."** This assertion cleared up the mist, revealed the essence, and profoundly dissected the inner connection between the Ch'ing government and imperialism.

Why did people want revolution? Why did they want to overthrow the Ch'ing Dynasty? In "Turn Back Quickly," Ch'en T'ien-hua wrote:

> Russia encircles us on three sides from the north.
> England plays its tricks through trade.
> France occupies Canton and looks toward Kweichow
> and Kwangsi.
> Germany takes Chiaochou and keeps a watch over the East.
> New Japan takes Taiwan and attempts to seize Fukien.
> America too wants to have a piece of the land.
> What part of China do I still have?
> This dynasty has perished altogether but in name.

How painful and indignant these words were! People wanted revolution because the Ch'ing court had become a "court of foreigners." They wanted to overthrow the Ch'ing regime because failing to do so would not save the country from being partitioned. The Chinese bourgeois revolutionaries proposed: If China wanted to "preserve its full independence, it must recover Weihai and Tsingtao, prevent Shanghai from being turned into an international concession, and see to it that the 18 provinces do not become the spheres of influence of any country."***

---

* "China's War," Selected Works of Lenin, Vol. I, pp. 214-215.

** "The Bankruptcy of the Idealist Conception of History," Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung, p. 1402.

*** Chang T'ai-yen, "Reply to Yu Min."

Did all this not possess an anti-imperialist and anti-colonial character? And was it merely a narrow-minded struggle against the Manchus?

The bourgeois revolutionaries demanded the establishment of a united bourgeois republic including the people of all nationalities in the country. They were deeply aware that if the various nationalities were divided in the country, that could only help tsarist Russia swallow Sinkiang and Mongolia and England annex Tibet, and the mother country, first dismembered, would eventually be reduced into a colony. Therefore, the moment Sun Yat-sen became the provisional president, he proclaimed in his "Presidential Declaration": "The foundation of the state lies among the people. To combine the lands of Han, Manchu, Mongol, Hui and Tibetan into one country and to combine the Hans, Manchus, Mongols, Huis and Tibetans into one people is the way to achieve national unification." This program to a certain degree reflected the common desires of the people of various nationalities in China to unite to fight imperialism.

At the same time, since the various countries in the East were one another enslaved by imperialism, China and its neighboring colonial and semi-colonial countries shared a common destiny. The Chinese revolution and the national liberation struggles of other oppressed states and nations in Asia were sympathetic to and supported one another. During the Revolution of 1911, the bourgeois revolutionaries clearly stated that nationalism as defined by them "refers not only to the Han nationality but also to other weak nations, those that have been conquered by other strong nations. Sovereignty should be restored to these nations wherever and whenever possible" and they should be "enabled to become fully independent."* In August 1907, revolutionaries in China, Korea, Vietnam, Burma, Malaysia, the Philippines, India and Japan jointly organized an "Asian Fraternity Association," also known as "Asian League." It was explicitly declared in its charter: /Members pledged/ "to fight against imperialism and preserve their respective states and nations," "to help one another with a view to enabling each maintain independence and keep the initiative in its own hand." The fact that Tikhvinskiy and associates vainly attempt to forge history in order to undermine the united anti-imperialist cause of the people of various countries in Asia shows that the new tsars of today, like the old tsars of yesterday, are downright Asian gendarme and are the sworn enemies of the national liberation struggles in Asia as a whole.

The awakening of the nations in the East was ardently hailed by Lenin, who said: "After the East has awakened, contemporary revolution enters a new era. The people of various nationalities in the East begin to intervene in the world's destiny and are no longer the targets for others to get rich."** And only those imperialist elements feared and

---

* Chang T'ai-yen, "On Five Nos."

** "Report at the Second Congress of Communist Party Organizations of Various Nations in the Eastern Section," Complete Works of Lenin, Vol. XXX, p. 137.

hated this national awakening. In 1910, an imperialist element of aggression against China cried out in alarm: "Such a national spirit has grown." "They begin to feel that they have the right to be equal to the great Western powers, that they should be equal and not inferior to others. Therefore they hate all forms of foreign domination and are sensitive to all external things." He saw this as the greatest danger.* It follows that the vicious slanders by Tikhvinskiy and associates are nothing new and only once more clearly reveal the ugly features of these social-chauvinists who completely betray Marxism-Leninism.

For more than a century, the Chinese people have waged a heart-stirring great struggle against imperialism and colonialism. There were the 1840-42 opium war against England, the 1856-60 war against the British-French joint forces, the 1851-64 T'ai-p'ing T'ien-kuo revolutionary war, the 1884 war against French aggression, and 1894 war against Japanese aggression, the 1900 war against the allied forces of the eight powers, and the revolution of 1911. Besides, there were two anti-Russian uprisings staged by the people of various nationalities east of the Wusuli River (Ussuri) in 1868 and 1880 respectively, the heroic struggle by the people of Illi against the forcible occupation of that region by tsarist Russia in 1871, the guerrilla war and the resist-Russia movement of far-reaching influence conducted by the people of various nationalities in the Northeast against tsarist Russia's forcible occupation of the Northeast from 1900 to 1905, and the struggle by the people of various nationalities against tsarist Russia's aggression against Sinkiang and conspiracy to divide Mongolia from 1912 to 1913. All these struggles illustrate the unwillingness of the Chinese people to submit to imperialism and its running dogs and their tenacious spirit of resistance. These struggles will be forever written into the historical records and tell both the new and old colonialists: "We Chinese have the spirit to fight the enemy to the last drop of our blood, the determination to recover our lost territory by our own efforts, and the ability to stand on our own feet in the family of nations."**

The great anti-imperialist struggles of the Chinese people are either obliterated or smeared by Tikhvinskiy and associates. And this is not something fortuitous. The Soviet revisionist press in its book reviews confesses that the reason why they have written such things about T'ai-p'ing T'ien-kuo, the I Ho Tuan, the revolution of 1911 and even the entire modern history of China is that they want to use this to overthrow such Marxist-Leninist principles as "rebellion is justified" and "great disorder under heaven." They also want to prove that peasants who

---

* Mood (穆德), The Crucial Period of the Christian Mission, New York, 1910, pp. 25-26.

** "On Tactics Against Japanese Imperialism," Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung, p. 147.

account for the overwhelming majority of the population in colonies and semi-colonies do not possess much revolutionary character, that peasant wars did not have much "historical role and meaning" in these countries, and that the struggle waged by the "backward, stupid and ignorant masses against international imperialist aggression" would surely end in failure.* To reverse the history of yesterday is to reverse the reality of today. This fully exposes the gloomy frame of mind of this group of renegades who are extremely hostile to the present anti-imperialist, anti-colonial and anti-hegemonic struggles by the people of the Third World. However, the people are awakening, the time is on the move, and the people of the Third World have resistibly stood up. Let these small clowns tremble!

World Domination: The Goal of Great Russian Chauvinism

To betray the Marxist-Leninist theory on the national question and to wilfully distort and slander the national liberation movements in colonies and semi-colonies -- this is not the goal pursued by Soviet revisionist social-imperialism. The real goal of social-chauvinism is world domination. This world domination is the axis around which all the lies of China's Modern History revolve.

Peddling this book, Soviet revisionist Pravda brags shamelessly: This book "was written in a convincing and clearcut manner with the spirit of proletarian internationalism." We will see what internationalism in word and hegemonism in deed is if only we turn the pages of this book.

For instance, in mid-17th century tsarist Russia, having annexed the vast regions of Siberia and turning it into a Russian colony, despatched a small handful of aggressors into the Heilung River valley, China's sacred territory. There, they burned and destroyed Chinese villages, killed Chinese inhabitants and forced Chinese inhabitants to pay tribute to tsarist Russia. This criminal history of blood and fire disappears completely under the pens of Tikhvinskiy and associates. What is left is only a fine idyllic song, called "Travel of Russian new land discoverers fearless of difficulties and dangers."**

For another instance, during the two opium wars, tsarist Russia carried out looting while the house was on fire, when it successively forced the Ch'ing government to sign the unequal Sino-Russian "Aigun Treaty," "Tientsin Treaty" and "Peking Treaty," forcibly taking away more

---

* Nikifrov, "Book Review: China's Modern History," Soviet Modern and Contemporary History No. 4, 1973; Miyasnikov (米亚斯尼科夫), "The Rise and Decline of the Ch'ing Empire," Soviet Far Eastern Problems No. 3, 1973.

** See the book China's Modern History, p. 56.

than a million square kilometers of Chinese land and securing more prerogatives in China than England, France and the United States. These aggressive outrages, which were again and again condemned by Marx and Engels, are made to disappear by Tikhvinskiy and associates. History has been completely reversed. The forcible occupation of Chinese territory by the old tsars was aimed at removing the "threat of forcible occupation by Western powers of the areas in the lower reaches of the Heilung River and along the coast" as a result of "active infiltration into the Far Eastern waters by England, the United States and France." It was also aimed at "preventing British influence from extending to the Central Asian territory under Russian jurisdiction." They also brazenly boast: "Russia was different from England and France in that it continued to maintain good neighbor relations with China in mid-19th century." "Either in respect to forcing China to accept unequal treaties or in respect to maintaining the treaty systems after 1860, the tsarist government had never showed an initiative."* It seems that these unequal treaties were imposed on Russia by the Ch'ing Dynasty.

In still another instance, during the revolution of 1911, the tsarist government directed a farce for "autonomy" of Outer Mongolia, being intent on cutting off Outer Mongolia from China. Strongly denouncing these gangster acts on behalf of the Bolshevik Party, Lenin said: "It condemns the attempt of our country to forcibly occupy the land of others for territorial expansion in the Bosporous Straits, the Turkey-held Armenia, Persia and China. It condemns the act of forcibly occupying Mongolia which undermines the friendly relations between our country and the great fraternal country, the Republic of China."** However, the appraisal made by Tikhvinskiy and associates is exactly opposite to this. They say: "Although the realization of autonomy by Mongolia took place under the condition where it was placed in an unequal and subordinate position vis-a-vis the tsarist Russian government, it nevertheless finally enabled the Mongolian people to establish still closer ties with Russia, the vanguard of the international revolutionary movement," and therefore this was "a progressive phenomenon."***

In short, according to the Soviet revisionists' "internationalism," tsarist Russian aggression became friendship, annexation good neighborliness, and flowery diplomatic language true history. According to this "internationalism," the old tsars, who perpetrated evil deeds to the best of their abilities, became sacred and benevolent angels, and the salvoes of external aggression fired by the tsarist government became

---

* Ibid., pp. 176, 240.

** "The Question of Workers' Representatives in the Duma and Their Declaration," Complete Works of Lenin, Vol. XVIII, p. 416.

*** China's Modern History, pp. 523-524.

peace gospels. Hi, folks, come and follow this lofty doctrine, lay down the weapons in your hands, open the door of your country, and sing and dance to welcome this "God" who dominates everything!

Here people can perceive the notorious Brezhnev doctrine. Today, aren't they turning Eastern Europe and Mongolia into their colonies through the so-called "international cooperation based on internationalist principles"? Aren't they engaged in large-scale infiltration, interference and subversion in various parts of the world through the so-called "good neighborliness," "friendship," and "cooperation"? Aren't they instigating one country to invade another sovereign country through the so-called support for "progressive forces"? Under the pretext of so-called "new land discovery," aren't they clamoring for occupying a large group of islands "west of the Hawaii Islands" in the Pacific, islands that were said to be once "discovered" by the Russians?

In the pursuit of world hegemony, the new tsars are not only more shameless and despicable than the old tsars, but are also more insidious and mad. Under the pens of Tikhvinskiy and associates, the Manchu, Mongol, Uighur, Hui and Tibetan nationalities became "non-Chinese nationalities." Under their pens, the Northeast, Outer Mongolia, Inner Mongolia, Sinkiang and Tibet, territories which had all along belonged to China and were unified under the rule of the Ch'ing government at that time, were objects of China's "foreign conquest" and "expansion." According to this reasoning, shouldn't all these nationalities and all these areas be cut off from China? Shouldn't they establish "still closer relations" with Russia? The new tsars indeed have a big appetite -- they not only want to take over the lands of other countries forcibly occupied by the old tsars and their aggressive rights and interests, but they also want to swallow the lands of other countries and aggressive rights and interests which the old tsars wanted but failed to seize.

"'World domination' is the content of imperialist policy."* It is by no means fortuitous that the great Russian chauvinism should be widely embraced in Moscow today. It is the inevitable result of the Soviet Union degenerating into a social-imperialist country; it is also the inevitable result of the new tsars committing aggression, expansion, interference, subversion, plunder and seeking to establish world hegemony everywhere in the world. Lenin said: "The policy of our country's autocratic system -- the reason for yet another intensification of old nationalism -- caused the growth of the Russian bourgeois class ideology and conscious counter-revolutionary character. Chauvinism among the bourgeoisie grows as its hatred against this international force,

---

* "A Caricature of Marxism and 'Imperialist Economism'," Complete Works of Lenin, Vol. XXIII, p. 26.

the proletariat, grows."* How applicable this statement is to the bureaucrat monopoly capitalist class ruling the Soviet Union today!

The appearance of this book by Tikhvinskiy and associates also fully shows the low level historical science has fallen to under the control of the Soviet revisionists. These so-called historians, in order to help the Soviet bureaucrat monopoly bourgeoisie to fulfill its dream of world domination, have sold out their souls for a crumb. They have not only turned historical science into a commodity, but have also turned themselves into commodities. They vie with each other in distorting and reversing history in order to raise their own prices as commodities.

However, judging by the historical process, the old tsars did not succeed but failed in their attempt to gain world domination with the help of great Russian chauvinism. It finally aroused the enslaved people of various nationalities in Russia to rise up to overthrow them and the people of various countries in the world suffering from aggression to rise up to oppose them. Today, the new tsars have again picked up this dirty weapon, and what better end can await them?

"Gentlemen, please don't play the music of the former dynasty; let's look at the willow branches that have grown afresh." In the world today, countries want independence, nations want liberation, and the people want revolution -- this has become an irresistible historical tide. Opposition to the power politics and hegemonism of the superpowers has become a common demand of all countries and peoples subject to the aggression, subversion, control, interference and bullying by the superpowers. The people of the Third World and the people of the whole world want unity. Clinging to the great Russian chauvinism and superpower hegemonism, the Soviet revisionist renegade clique will finally be buried by the revolutionary storms of the world's people.

* * *

---

* "Attack on Finland," Complete Works of Lenin, Vol. XVI, p. 170.

The History of the Willow Pale and the Fallacies of the Soviet Revisionists

by

Chi Shih (纪实)

(Li-shih Yen-chiu /Historical Research/, No. 3, June 20, 1975)

The Willow Pale was a willow fence put up by the government of the Ch'ing Dynasty along the Liao River valley to mark the limits of the prohibited area. Ordinary inhabitants were not allowed to cross the fence to hunt, graze or pick ginseng. The Willow Pale had long become a vestige of history. But in order to meet the needs of their expansionist policies, the Soviet revisionist social-imperialists had the nerve to insist in their Government Statement of June 13, 1969, that the Willow Pale,which had nothing to do with a national boundary, constituted the "national borderline" of China's Northeast under the Ch'ing Dynasty. They said, "The royal subjects in Manchuria would be considered as leaving the country if they went beyond the limits of the 'Willow Pale'." They vainly attempted to prove that the vast stretches of territory in the Heilung River and the Wusuli /Ussuri/ River valleys beyond the Willow Pale were not Chinese territory. And their hired scholars produced a piece entitled "On the History of the Formation of the Russian-Chinese Border," in which they referred to the Willow Pale as a "border fortification line" built in the time of K'ang Hsi, "an impregnable forest belt." They also said that "an uninhabited and desolate area of virgin forest belt several hundred kilometers wide" stretched from the Willow Pale to the banks of the Heilung River. Such groundless utterances could not be more absurd! Let us unveil the history of the Willow Pale and see just how utterly preposterous are these lies dished up by the Soviet revisionist renegade clique and its hired scholars!

I. The Causes of Appearance of the Willow Pale in the Years of Shun Chih in the Ch'ing Dynasty

In the late 16th and early 17th centuries, with the decline of the influence of the Ming Dynasty, the Manchus Nurhaci and Huangtaichi, local Ming officials in the northeast region, rose to power, gradually unified the vast areas of the Northeast, and replaced the Ming court as rulers there. In the course of unifying the Northeast, Nurhaci established the Later Chin regime in 1616, and moved his capital to Shengyang (later renamed Shengching) in 1625. In 1636, Huangtaichi changed Later Chin into Ch'ing. It was only after the Ch'ing unified the vast areas in the Northeast that work started on the Willow Pale in the Liao River valley and parts of Kirin.

Why did the Manchu aristocrats want to build the Willow Pale?

After the Ch'ing army poured down south of the Shanhai Pass in 1644, Fu Lin (Shun Chih) established a central government headed by the Manchu aristocrats in Peking not long after he ascended the throne. As the Manchu

rulers saw it, the Liao River valley and parts of Kirin were "vital areas where their ancestors thrived and rose to power."* To preserve the special character of this region, it was declared a special region which was not open to people of other nationalities, especially the Hans. Meantime, when the Ch'ing had just come down the Pass, the situation of struggle behind the Pass was extremely complicated, such that class contradictions, national contradictions and those arising within the ruling class became interwoven. Faced with this complicated situation, the ruling group of Manchu aristocrats built the Willow Pale with a view to protecting their "homeland" to safeguard their "fundamental interests." Just as Emperor Ch'ien Lung said in his "Old Frontier Verses": "Race across the map in wars of conquest, but the home base should also be guarded."** This clearly shows that the purpose of building the Willow Pale in the early Ch'ing was to safeguard their "home base."

The greater part of the Liao River valley was farmland. In order to mitigate the class contradictions within the Manchu nationality, maintain a regular armed strength of eight banners and create contradictions among the different nationalities so as to dominate them, the Ch'ing rulers drew up a policy that favored the banner people (within the Manchu, Mongolian and Han armies) with special treatment. To carry out this policy, the Ch'ing Dynasty from its early years gave the officers and men of the eight banners and their dependents large amounts of fertile land in the Liao River valley in order to maintain the economic privileges of the banner men.*** The Ch'ing rulers strictly prohibited Hans or members of other nationalities not belonging to the eight banners from moving into the Willow Pale to farm or graze.

In the Northeast, areas closest to the mountains and rivers were rich in such products as ginseng, mink, pearls and antlers. These areas were rather widely distributed, a number of which were located inside the Willow Pale, but a greater number were located outside it. The Manchu aristocrats, in order to keep these special products to themselves, also marked off these producing areas outside the Willow Pale as forbidden areas and prevented people within the Pale (including the Manchus) from freely flowing to outside the Pale so as to insure the Manchu aristocrats of their economic interests. Therefore the Willow Pale was a boundary line protecting not only the "vital cradle land of the Manchus," but also the forbidden areas outside it, including the enclosures of the imperial family.

---

* General Records of Shengching, Vols. VIII-IX.

* Ibid., Vol. XVI.

*** Actual Records of the Ch'ing Sheng Tsu, Vol. XXCVII: In the 18th year of K'ang Hsi (1679), the areas were surveyed, extending to Fushun in the east, to Ningyuanchou (now as Hsingch'eng) in the west, K'aip'ing in the south and K'aiyuan in the north. A total of 5,484,155 shang of arable land were found, of which the eight banners contributed 4,605,380 shang. These banner fields dotted the areas that lay behind the Willow Pale.

In the early years of Ch'ing, the Willow Pale also served as an administrative zone demarcation line. For instance, it was recorded in "General Records of Feng T'ien": "The Ch'ing originated in the Northeast and incorporated Mongolia, and a Pale was built to mark the limits showing herdsmen and hunters where they should operate. Gates were built along the Pale and guarded by troops to keep the peace."*

A great deal of historical facts have shown that the Willow Pale of the Ch'ing Dynasty was built only after the length and breadth of the Northeast was unified under the Ch'ing, and that it was not only intended by the ruling groups of the Manchu aristocrats to protect the "vital cradle area" of the Ch'ing imperial family, but also as a means by which they could monopolize the economic privileges in the Northeast while also serving as a demarcation line that divided the Northeast into several administrative zones. It is clear that the Willow Pale of the Ch'ing Dynasty had nothing to do at all with China's national boundary in its Northeast.

II. The Construction of the Willow Pale and Its Alterations

Harboring ulterior motives, the hired scholars of the Soviet revisionists insist that the Willow Pale built in the Liao River valley during the reign of Shun Chih (1644-1661) was "a border fortification line constructed in Southern Manchuria under orders of the Manchu Emperor K'ang Hsi in 1678," and that it constituted "an impregnable forest belt."** This is an outright fabrication of history.

What was the Willow Pale? During the time of K'ang Hsi, Yang Pin had this to say in his "Brief Notes of the Willow Pale": "Today areas east of Liao have been fenced with willow branches, which are three or four feet tall at some sections while only one or two feet tall in others. It resembled the bamboo fences of the Central Plains."+ Obviously, the Willow Pale was a fence made of willow branches. An earth embankment of three feet wide and three feet tall was erected. Three willow branches were planted at an interval of every five feet, and were connected by ropes. In his poem "The Willow Pale," the Emperor Ch'ien Lung noted: "As I ride my horse east along the Pale, I can jump over it or shoot through it."++ Here the Soviet revisionists are given a slap in the face loud and clear when they say that the Willow Pale was "an impregnable forest belt."

---

* General Annals of Feng T'ien," Vol. LXXVIII.

** "On the History of the Formation of the Russian-Chinese Border."

\+ Yang Pin, Brief Record of the Willow Pale, Vol. I.

++ General Records of Shengching, Vol. XIII.

The Willow Pale in the Liao River valley began to be built in the first year of Shun Chih by separate sections and was completed in the 18th year of Shun Chih (1661).* It started from the southwest of Fenghuang City (now Fengch'eng in Liaoning) in the south, ran northeast to Hsinching (now Hsinpin in Liaoning) and then turned back to northwest to Weiyuanpao, northeast of Kaiyuan; from Weiyuanpao it turned southwest to meet the Great Wall at Shanhaikuan, covering a total of 1,950 li. It was known as the "Old Pale," or the "Shenching Pale Wall." As to the section that ran into Kirin, it was a single pale that started from Weiyuanpao and ran slightly toward northeast to Fateha (now known as Fat'e north of Kirin city), and was built from the 9th to the 20th year of K'ang Hsi (1670-1681). It covered 690 li in length, and was known as the "New Pale." The general feature of Willow Pale was that it formed a "人" shaped barricade that joined the four important route centers of Shanhaikuan, Weiyuanpao, Fenghuang City and Fateha. Here it must be pointed out that the Soviet revisionists harbor an ulterior motive when they say that the Willow Pale in the Liao River valley was built in 1678 (the 17th year of K'ang Hsi) after the gangsters of tsarist Russia intruded in China's Heilung River valley and before the Nipuchu Treaty was signed. The reason was that since then the army and people of the Ch'ing Dynasty started the Yaksa war against tsarist Russian invasion. The Soviet revisionists attempted to use this to prove that it was the Ch'ing Dynasty that occupied "the land incorporated into Russian territory," thereby writing off at one stroke of the pen the historical fact that the Heilung and Wusuli River valleys had been Chinese territory since ancient times. This is sheer wishful thinking.

Along the full length of the Willow Pale, there were originally 21 gates opened at various sections, but later one was closed. From Shanhaikuan to Fenghuang City there were altogether 16 gates. The "New Pale" running through Kirin from Weiyuanpao northeastward had four gates opened. The

---

* Complete Records of the Great Ch'ing, Vol. XLIV, General Records of Shengching, Vol. XVI (1st year of Ch'ien Lung): The gate of Paishihtsui was "first established at Shuik'ou in the 8th year of Shun Chih." General Records of Shengching, Vol. LI (47th year of Ch'ien Lung): The gate of Hsint'ai was "built in the 11th year of Shun Chih." (Unless otherwise indicated, the General Records of Shengching referred to in this article is that published in the 47th year of Ch'ien Lung.) General Records of Shengching, Vol. XIX (1st year of Ch'ien Lung): "The gate of Mingshuit'ang was built at P'ingch'uanying in the 11th year of Shun Chih" and "the gate of Lishukou was opened at Heishankou in the 11th year of Shun Chih." According to Kang Hsi "Records of Kuangning County," Vol. V, "Records of Chin County," Vol. V, "Records of Ningyuanchou," Vol. V, "Records of the Capital of Chinchou," Vol. VIII and Hsien Feng Records of K'aiyuan County, Vol. V: All the gates of Sungling, Chiukuantai, Ch'ingho, Paituch'ang, Changwutai and Faku were guarded by troops in the 11th year of Shun Chih. Therefore, the Willow Pale in the Liao River valley was completed by the 18th year of Shun Chih (1661).

eastern section of the "Old Pale" running from Weiyuanpao to Fenghuang City was administered by the Shengching military authority. The west section running from Weiyuanpao to Shanhaikuan was overseen by a general from Shengching.* The "New Pale" was put under the administration of the Ninguta Command.*

In order to control the vintage points of communications, the Ch'ing government had the gates of the Willow Pale located at the major roadways. Through these passages, access could be gained to Shanhaikuan and to various areas of the Northeast including Mongolia and the Heilung River valley. For example, the Weiyuanpao Gate was located at "the strategic point between Heilungkiang and Kirin,"** while Fateha Gate was located at the point leading to Baituna and Heilungkiang."+ The land transport courier stations in the times of Ch'ing had the Huanghua Station at Peking as the center, and the Northeast passage led to Shengching via the Huanghua Station before it reached the various gates from Shengching, thereby linking the vast regions of the Northeast together. In order to carry out brutal feudal exploitation and strict political control over the people, the Ch'ing rulers stipulated that inhabitants of various nationalities entering or leaving these gates to carry out production must produce passes issued by the related departments or would be guilty of entering "prohibited grounds." These passes were not transferable. A person who sold or bought such a pass would be put in jail for two months and given a hundred strokes of the cane.++ Thus, the pale gates were used by the Ch'ing government and especially the local governments to extort the people of various nationalities. Take the Weiyuanpao gate for instance: "At that time, a horse wagon that went through the gates was required to pay a tax of 200 wen /an ancient monetary unit/ for exit and 400 wen for entry, with higher taxes for people coming from Kirin. Even a burial procession that passed through the gate had to pay tax.+++

To suit the needs of the rulers, in the 14th (1675), 18th (1679), 25th (1686) and 36th (1697) years of K'ang Hsi, the west section of the "Old Pale" was extended four times from the Mingshuit'ang Gate up to Sunglingtzu Gate in the north. In the case of the Paishihtsui Gate, "it

---

* General Records of Shengching, Vols. 33 and 51; General Study of Ch'ing Documents, Vol. 182.

** General Records of Shengching, Vol. XIX; Hsien Feng Records of Kaiyuan County, Vol. II.

\+ General Records of the Great Ch'ing, Vol. XXXIII.

++ Complete Records of the Great Ch'ing, Vol. 889.

+++ "Factual Records of Investigation on Construction of the Willow Pale."

was first set up at Shuik'ou in the 8th year of Shun Chih, but with the extension of the pale to Kaot'aipao in the 14th year of K'ang Hsi, to K'uangpang in the 25th year and finally to Paishihtsui in the 36th year, it was installed at Paishihtsui."* Again, in the case of the Hsint'ai Gate, "originally a gate was opened at Ch'ints'aikou, 40 li northwest of the city (Ningyuanchou), but in the 14th year of K'ang Hsi, the pale was extended to Ertaoho, and in the 36th year it was finally extended to where it is now."** According to an investigation into the construction of the Willow Pale, "the place called Hsint'aimen was originally in the possession of a Mongol prince, Ta Wang, who at that time lived on rents paid by Han people, who tilled the land. Hsint'ai Gate was set up at Chiuren (northwest of Hsinch'eng county), 40 li away from here. Hsint'ai Gate was set up only after extension of the Pale."*** The four extensions of the Willow Pale during the reign of K'ang Hsi were strong indication that the building of the Willow Pale and its extensions were based on the requirements of the rulers, so that the Willow Pale had nothing to do at all with the "national boundary."

III. The Nature and Role of the Willow Pale

The Soviet revisionists insist on viewing such a Willow Pale as the northern "frontier marking"+ of the Ch'ing Dynasty while saying that the land from the Willow Pale to along the bank of the Heilung River was a "buffer zone" of "no man's land."++ In other words, the land that lay outside the Willow Pale was not Chinese territory. This is indeed a big joke.

Quite the contrary, apart from marking out the limits of the "prohibited areas," the more important role of the Willow Pale was to mark the demarcation lines that divided Shengching from the administrative districts including Ninguta and Inner Mongolia. The Emperor Ch'ien Lung was very clear about that in his poem "The Willow Pale": "Inexhaustible are the forest resources in the mountains that stretch far out, around which a fence has been erected to keep peple from trespassing. The divisions of Shengching and Kirin are so marked that the formidable defense lines of Mongolia may serve to repel any enemy attack."+++ According to "Unofficial Notes

---

* General Records of the Great Ch'ing, Vol. XLIV.

** General Records of Shengching, Vol. XXXIII.

*** "Factual Records of Investigation on Construction of the Willow Pale."

\+ "Soviet Government Statement of June 13" /1969/

++ "On the History of Formation of Russian-Chinese Border."

+++ General Record of Shengching, Vol. XIII.

on Kirin": "Proceeding southwest of Wula (now Kirin City) in Kirin to Weiyuanpao where it marks the limit of Shengching, it covers a full 570 li."* The "Brief Records of the Willow Pale" had this to say when it referred to the administrative jurisdiction of the Ninguta Command: "The Ninguta Command included under it.....and west to Weiyuanpao, the boundary of Shengching."** Again according to the investigation on the construction of the Willow Pale, "The Weiyuanpao of the past was a place where you could find three boundary markings at one step. Beyond the Weiyuanpao Gate was the boundary line with Kirin, and the place was flanked by Kaiyüan county and Hsifeng county."*** The above-mentioned "Old Pale" was guarded by the Shengching Command stationed in Liaoning, and the "New Pale" was under the administration of the Ninguta Command stationed in Kirin. This clearly showed that the Weiyuanpao section of the Willow Pale formed the demarcation line between the two areas, Shengching and Ninguta. The west section where the "Old Pale" and the "New Pale" joined divided three administrative districts, Shengching, Ninguta and Inner Mongolia. "The Complete Records of the Great Ch'ing" notes: "Beyond the Pale west of Kirin and K'aiyüan is the grazing grounds of the Mongolian Khorchin and other tribes."+ During the reign of K'ang Hsi, Kao Shih-ch'i wrote in his "Diary of Travels East with the Emperor": "The last of the routes was through the Willow Pale which had willow branches planted on the ground and fastened with cords to mark the limits of Mongolia."++ West of that line was the Mongolian grazing grounds under the administration of a Mongol prince; districts to the east were under th Shengching or Ninguta Commands. It is perfectly clear that the Willow Pale was but a line marking the administrative districts in the Northeast of the Ch'ing Dynasty. How absurd it is for the Soviet revisionists to take a deer for a hors when they take the administrative boundary line to be "national border"! There are indeed boundary lines for provinces, counties and banners. "The Record of Laws and Systems of the Ch'ing Dynasty" noted: "When the nation was first set up, it was divided into banners each having its own boundaries."# "Since there was a lot of virgin land around Shengching, it was distributed to the banner men who marked their own boundaries."## By looking upon the Willow Pale as a "national boundary," it would be as preposterous as regarding the special administered region of the Tsar, Alexandrova Village, as the national borderline of Russia.

---

* Unofficial Notes on Kirin, Vol. II.

** "Brief Record of the Willow Pale."

*** "Factual Records of Investigation on Construction of the Willow Pale."

\+ Complete Records of the Great Ch'ing, Vol. LX.

++ Kao Shih-ch'i: "Diary of Travels East with the Emperor."

\# Record of Laws and Systems of the Ch'ing Dynasty, Vol. 137.

Notes on East China, Vol. XXVI.

Beyond the Willow Pale were also large tracts of restricted areas belonging to the Ch'ing imperial family. For instance, beyond the east section of the "Old Pale" was the Shengching enclosure with a radius of more than 500 li.* In the districts where the Mongolian tribes settled there was the Baituna enclosure, and at Ach'eng in Heilungkiang there was the Alechuke enclosure. The "vital cradle land of their ancestors," located beyond the Willow Pale at Shanhsing (Ilan in Heilungkiang) and the Ch'angpaishan area were also restricted areas from the start. The Ch'ing Dynasty also laid down rules as to how the gods of Ch'angpaishan should be worshipped. Every year, "two rituals in the spring and autumn respectively were conducted by the deputy commander-in-chief of the Kirin Command accompanied by officials sent by the Shengching Ministry of Rituals. If it were a state function, the ceremony would be attended by ministers of the Imperial Court."** As the various emperors of the Ch'ing Dynasty made repeated "trips" to the Northeast, all of them went to Ch'angpaishan to worship and wrote poems about their visit, thus indicating the importance they attached to these ceremonies. There were many more restricted areas producing ginseng and pearls. Is it not clear enough that when the Ch'ing Dynasty had such vast areas that lay beyond the Willow Pale drawn into restricted areas, especially when they also had part of the "vital cradle land of their ancestors" located beyond the Willow Pale, the Willow Pale could not be regarded as a "national boundary"?

Historical facts have already shown that the Northeast was unified by the Ch'ing long before their entry into Shankaikuan. With the strengthening of the Ch'ing rule in the Northeast, the vast Northeast region including the Willow Pale fell into the administration of the Ch'ing Dynasty, without any confusion to the territorial sovereignty and administrative divisions. In 1644, when the Ch'ing regime first moved into Shanhaikuan, its capital was established at Shunt'ienfu (now Peking) while retaining Shengching (Shenyang) as a reserve capital. Subsequently, the whole of the Northeast region was placed under the control of an interior minister stationed at Shengching. Starting from the reign of Shun Chih, the Ch'ing government successively established "in the Northeast three military commands within and beyond the Willow Pale, namely, the Shengching Command, the Ninguta Command, and the Aigun Command (the Heilungkiang Command)."*** The three commands were established in the following order: in the 3rd year of Shun Chih (1646), the Anbanchanking (昂邦章京) of Fengt'ien was established (later to be renamed the garrison command for Liaotung in the first year of K'ang Hsi,

---

* Complete Records of the Great Ch'ing, Vol. 573: The Shengching enclosure "extended more than 480 li from the Sha River and the Shantao River south of Erhlangtou in the south to the Itao River north of A-chi-ko-se-le in the north; more than 510 li from Lotolitzu in the southeast to where Shanyinhata joined the northwest barricade in the northwest; and more than 520 li from the Ying-o Gate in the southwest to Se-chu-le-a-lin in the northeast."

** General Records of Shengching, Vol. XXVII.

*** Yang Pin, Brief Records of the Willow Pale, Vol. I.

and again renamed the garrison command for Fengt'ien in the 4th year, namely, the Shengching Command stationed at Shenyang guarding Liaoning); in the 10th year of Shun Chih (1653), "an Anbanchanking was established at Ninguta with the deputy commander-in-chief heading it," (in the first year of K'ang Hsi, the Ninguta Anbanchanking was renamed the garrison command for Ninguta stationed at Ning-an in Heilungkiang overlooking Kirin);* in the 22nd year of K'ang Hsi (1683), in order to strengthen the defenses in the Heilungkiang area against the aggression of Tsarist Russia, the Heilungkiang Command was established (stationed at Aigun overlooking Helungkiang). Sabusu (萨布素), the deputy commander-in-chief of the Ninguta Command, decorated for his merits during the resistance against the aggressors of Tsarist Russia, was appointed General. Worth noting was the fact that when the Anbanchanking garrisoning Kirin was set up, construction of the Willow Pale in the Liao River valley had just begun, and the "New Pale" running through the Kirin section did not exist. Was there a country on earth which mapped out a national boundary but placed its administrative organs and districts outside this line?

The scope of the administrative districts put under the three commands in the Northeast was also well-defined. The scope of administration of the Ninguta Command extended east to the Sea of Japan, southeast to the seashores off the Hsiketa Mountains (the Sikhote Range), northeast to the seashores of Fei-ya-ke (the Okhotsk Sea),with the Sakhalin Island included.** The Heilungkiang Command controlled an area that extended from Tsitsihar more than 2,200 li east to the Yelibaih (野里白赫) River which marked the boundary between it and Ninguta, more than 900 li west to Kurk (喀尔喀) where it bordered Tsech'enkhan (车臣汗), more than 500 li south to the Sungari River where it bordered Ninguta, and more than 3,300 li to the outer Khingan Ranges where it bordered Russia.***

The three Commands established in the Northeast by the Ch'ing Dynasty not only had their own respective spheres of administration, but also had under them a complete administrative apparatus comprising all levels of officials. Take for example the garrison stationed in Heilungkiang City. It had a deputy commander-in-chief, 4 assistant commanders, 16 command aides, 8 Solun and Tahur aides, 2 Han Army aides, 8 defense officers, 26 imperial guardsmen, 4 civilian officers and one administrator of the seventh grade,+ among whom the military responsibilities over the various areas were shared. "The full course of the Heilung River and all its tributaries" fell under the administrative jurisdiction of the Heilungkiang Command, in other words, "all of it was Chinese territory."++ Lenin had this to say: "The

---

* Complete Records of the Great Ch'ing, Vol. LVII; "The Shengching General Command."

** Yang Pin, Brief Records of the Willow Pale, Vol. I.

*** General Records of Shengching," Vol. XII, 1st year of Ch'ien Lung.

\+ Ibid., Vol. LII.

++ Actual Records of Ch'ing Sheng Tsu, Vol. 135.

standing army and the police constitute the principal tools of violence making up state power." (The State and Revolution) The establishment of the three Commands in the Northeast and the standing armies in the various districts was evidence of the sovereignty exercised by the Ch'ing government over the vast Northeast region. It established the fact that what existed between the Willow Pale and the Heilung River valley was not "no man's land" but Chinese territory under the Ch'ing Dynasty.

The vast stretches of territory that lay beyond the Willow Pale was certainly not "an uninhabited and desolate piece of land," but on the contrary, ever since the rule of Ch'ing, there was certain progress made in its social economy, transportation and cultural undertakings. During the reign of K'ang Hsi, the variety of agricultural products grown around Ninguta was quite impressive, and included ten kinds of cereals.* Others such as "Aigun wheat flour surpassed those grown in the Middle Plains in fragrance, and was best used in the making of pancakes,"** which were the favorite at the time. By then the vital communications points were Wula of Kirin, Ninguta, Baituna (also known as Hsinch'eng) Ilan Hala (Heilungkiang's Ilan), Pukui (Tsitsihar), Murken and Aigun, the famous seven outlying towns beyond the Willow Pale that were prospering commercially. In Kirin's Wula, "families that came from the Middle Plains numbered more than a thousand, and all kinds of commodities poured in from other areas. In fact, it had everything including magnificent houses, a big city in itself beyond the Willow Pale."*** Inside the west gate of Ninguta, "streets extended from west to east, and as people opened up shops to trade, the population began to swell and goods and merchants flooded the town.+ As to Pukui, it was also "the vital junction of roads in all directions, to become the city among towns,"++ and "as one entered the south gate of T'uch'eng and walked into Much'eng for a mile or so, he would come across a street bustling with commercial activity, accompanied with all the noise one could hear in a market."+++ From the beginning of Ch'ing, a communications network of stations was also set up in the Heilung River valley linking the seven towns beyond the Willow Pale with other districts. The "Brief Notes on the Willow Pale" records: The Ninguta Command had under it 22 stations, 7 of which were along the route southwest of Wula in Kirin to Yeh-ho, 8 along the route that ran northeast to Ninguta, and 7 along the route running southwest to Baituna. The Heilungkiang Command

---

* Yang Pin, Brief Records of the Willow Pale, Vol. III.

** Fang Shih-chi, "Brief Notes on Lung Sha."

*** Yang Pin, Brief Records of the Willow Pale, Vol. I.

\+ Wu Chen-ch'en, Brief Notes on Ninguta, p. 2.

++ Hsi Ch'ing, "Unofficial Notes on Heilungkiang," Vol. I.

+++ Fang Shih-chi, "Brief Notes on Lung Sha," p. 9.

had 19 stations which dotted the route that ran southwest from Heilungkiang City to Maohsinsusu,* with another 10 that were added later with the opening up of the route that ran from Tsitsihar to Hulenbar and 6 along the route opened from Ulanor to Hulan.** In every station there were a certain number of officials, laborers as well as horses and bulls, in other words, the station system was very complete. In the 24th year of K'ang Hsi (1685), with the opening up of a school in Merken, other places such as Tsitsihar "all had their government-run schools."*** These facts forcefully expose the lie of the Soviet revisionists that "from the Willow Pale to the banks of the Amur River (the Heilung River) there lay several hundred kilometers of desolateness."

In order to maintain their feudal rule, the Ch'ing rulers prohibited people from going into the Willow Pale or near it to pick ginseng, dive for pearls and cultivate the land, and, in the case of banner men, to mix. But the development of history always ran contrary to the wishes of these rulers. During the reign of K'ang Hsi, "among the mountain climbers (illegal pickers of ginseng), most came from west of Shantung," and "numbered more than ten thousand every year," so that "by the 23rd and 24th year of K'ang Hsi, the areas around Wula and Ninguta had already been picked clean of ginseng."+ By the 40th year of Ch'ien Lung (1775), the officials of Shengching submitted that "Of the various prefectures and counties around Fengt'ien and the areas where the banner settlements were located, the banner people mixed over the whole areas such that there was no dividing line separating the banners."++ Obviously, by the time of Ch'ien Lung, the Willow Pale was there only in name, and Ch'ien Lung himself said: "Having it is no different from not having it."+++ Subsequently, with the role of the Willow Pale becoming less and less important, the Ch'ing government had to make repeated proclamations forbidding people living south of Shanhaikuan to migrate to the Northeast. In the 8th year of Chia Ch'ing (1803), an imperial decree read: "Beyond the Shanhaikuan lies the three provinces of the Northeast which are the essential base areas of Manchuria, and where migrant people were formerly prohibited to settle and cultivate the land on their own for fear that it would effect the livelihood of the banner people. This restriction has been in effect for many years....

---

* Yang Pin, Brief Records of the Willow Pale, Vol. II.

** Hsi Ch'ing, "Unofficial Notes on Heilungkiang," Vol. II.

*** Ibid., Vol. III.

\+ Yang Pin, Brief Records of the Willow Pale, Vol. III.

++ "Factual Records of Ch'ing Kao Tsung," Vol. 99.

+++ General Records of Shengching, Vol. XIII, Poem "The Willow Pale."

The Governors of Shantung, on receiving imperial instructions, forbid people leaving the province with their families."* This decree suggested that the restricted areas had been expanded to include the entire "three provinces." This is also a forceful refutation of the lies cooked up by Soviet revisionist social-imperialism that the Willow Pale marked the "northern frontier" of the Ch'ing Dynasty.

By going through the brief history of the Willow Pale, we can easily see just how the Soviet revisionists have gone out of their way to twist and fabricate the history of the Willow Pale in the times of the Ch'ing Dynasty. They treacherously fabricate lies and spread rumors in an attempt to prove that the land beyond the Willow Pale was not Chinese territory. The shameful acts of the Soviet revisionist renegade clique have not only shown that the new Tsars are defending the crimes of the old Tsars in having annexed more than a million square kilometers of Chinese territory, but also revealed that they have frantic territorial ambitions toward China. However, the wheel of history rolls steadily onward. The old Tsars met their shameful defeat, and the new Tsars with their designs for world hegemony will surely suffer a more shameful defeat!

* * *

---

* "Notes on East China: Chia Ch'ing,"

Li-shih Yen-chiu /Historical Research/, No. 3,

June 20, 1975

Table of Contents

The Touchstone for True and False Marxism (1)
- by Theoretical Group of the Party School of CCP Tientsin Municipal Committee SPRCM 838

Proletarian Dictatorship Is Our Heirloom
- by Workers Theoretical Group of Nanking Chemical Industrial Company SPRCM 838

Understand Some History of Social Development
- by Workers Theoretical Groups of Peking Optics Meter Plant and Peking Instruments Plant and Political Economy Group of Department of Political Education, Peking Normal University

The Chingkangshan Spirit Shines Forever
- by Tsou Wen-chieh, Captain of Former Riot Squad, and Ma Hsia-chi, Woman Red Army Fighter, Chingkangshan

Promote the "Pauper's" Spirit, Firmly Take the Socialist Road -- Fragments of history of Hsipu Village, Tsunhua County, Hopei Province
- by "Hsipu Village History" Compilation Group of Peking Normal College

The Rank Order and Lin Piao's Conspiracy To Restore Capitalism - by Liang Hsiao SPRCM 833

The Landlord Class Regime and Feudal Ownership in Ch'in and Early Han - by Shou Kang and Li Shih-shu

The English Bourgeois Revolution and the Reform in Land Ownership - by Workers Theoretical Group of Wuhan Port Bureau and World History Teaching Research Room of Department of History, Wuhan University

Han Fei's Criticism and Transformation of the Thought of "Lao Tzu" - by Workers Theoretical Group of 2nd Central Laboratory, Shanghai No. 5 Steel Mill and Yen Feng, Futan University **SPRCM 837**

The Thought and Time of Shih Ta Ching (十大经)
- by K'ang Li

Taoism and Confucian-Legalist Struggle in Western Han
- by Lan Szu **SPRCM 834**

Expose the Fraud of "Tung Yung Practices Filial Piety"
- by Theoretical Group of Laowu Commune, Hsiaokan County, Hupeh and Mass Criticism Group of Department of History, Hua Chung (Central China) Normal College

The Historical Experience of the T'aip'ing T'ienkuo Concerning the Problem of Unity
- by Hung Ch'eng **SPRCM 837**

The History of the Willow Pale and the Fallacies of the Soviet Revisionists - by Chi Shih SPRCM 850

Tsarist Russia's Tool of Aggression Against China -- the Mission of the Russian Orthodox Church
- by Fang Hsiu **SPRCM 847**

Talks on China's Ancient History

First Talk: The Prolonged, Classless Primitive Society
- by History Research Group of Dynamics Division, Hungch'i Shipyard, Talien

Second Talk: The Formation and Development of Slave Society -- Hsia, Shang and Western Chou - by Theoretical Group of Ch'engte Military Sub-district, Hopei Province, the Chinese People's Liberation Army

Notes on History Reading:

One Must Not Stay in the "Cosy Nest" -- Reading Fan Kuai's Persuasion to Liu Pang to "Leave the House" - by Men Teng-k'ai and Sung Chih-fu

* * *

Li-shih Yen-chiu /Historical Research/, No. 4,

August 20, 1975

Table of Contents

The Touchstone for True and False Marxism (2) SPRCM 846

How the Soviet Revisionists Turn Socialist Ownership into Capitalist Ownership - by Chin Chiu-lien and Nan Ching

The Legalist Line and Stability in Early Han - by Ch'i Liang-hsiao SPRCM 843

On Chu-ko Liang Bringing Stability to Central-South /China/ - by Ma Yao, Yunnan University

Roving Knights -- a Critique - by Li Ssu-yen

Promote the Nanniwan Spirit, Carry the Revolutionary Work Through to the End - by CCP Committee of Unit 84870

The Huai River -- Present and Past* - by "Huai River's New Life" Compilation Group

The Exploration of Petroleum and Natural Gas and the Confucian-Legalist Struggle in Ancient China - by Theoretical Group of No. 1 Division, Multi-Purpose Institute, Petrochemical Scientific Research Academy SPRCM 846

Develop the Economy, Consolidate Political Power -- Read Ch'ao Ts'o's "Memorial on Giving Priority to Grain" - by Theoretical Group of Unit 52875, Chinese PLA SPRCM 846

Pre-Ch'in Legalists on War Preparedness -- A Tentative Discussion - by Hung Ch'eng SPRCM 843

---

* To appear in a later issue.

The Iron Wall -- Notes on tunnel warfare in Chiaochuanghu Village - by People's Armed Forces Department, Shun-i County, Peking Municipality and Department of History of the Chinese Communist Party, Peking Normal University

Wang Yang-ming's Counter-Revolutionary Double-Dealing Tactics and His Study of the "Mind" -- Exposing Wang's criminal features of suppressing the uprisings by Yao and Chuang people in Kwangsi - by Chuang Ning

The Bourgeoisie and the Doctrines of Confucius and Mencius - by T'ien Li

The Yaksa War Was a Just War Waged by China Against Tsarist Russian Aggression -- Refuting the fallacies of the Soviet revisionists in distorting the nature of the Yaksa War * - by Ch'Ün Che

Nevelskoy -- Vanguard of Tsarist Russian Aggression in the Heilung River Valley in Mid-19th Century* - by Chih Li and Chung O

Wang Ts'ung-erh, General Commander of Eight Armies (profile of a woman hero of peasant uprisings) - by Shih Li

Talks on China's Ancient History

The Third Talk: Periods of Major Change in the Transition from the Slave to the Feudal System -- the Spring and Autumn and Warring States Periods - by Workers History Research Group of Shanghai Municipal Heavy-Duty Machinery Manufacturing Company

On Chou Ya-fu Disciplining the Army (Notes on History Reading) - by Shih Yen

Tsai Yü Is Not a Rebel of the Confucian School - by Wu Ju-huang

---

* To appear in a later issue.

It Is "答亡," Not "答在" -- Concerning a wrong character in the 1905 Edition of "A Critique of Confucius" - by Chin Li

* * *

END

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
National Technical Information Service
Springfield, Va. 22161

OFFICIAL BUSINESS

PRINTED MATTER

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
COM-211